THE

BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

WITH A

VIEW OF THE STATE OF THE ROMAN WORLD AT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

BY

GEORGE P. FISHER, D. D.

PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN YALE COLLEGE;
AUTHOR OF "ESSAYS ON THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY,"
"THE REFORMATION," ETC.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1916

Πάντες γὰρ ἄνθρωποι περὶ θεῶν ἔχουσιν ὑπόληψιν.

ARISTOTLE, *de Cœlo*, I. 3.

Aliud est de silvestri cacumine videre patriam pacis . . . et aliud tenere viam illuc ducentem.

AUGUSTINE, *Confess.*, VII., xxi.

Salvation is of the Jews.

JOHN iv. 20.

We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us.

II COR. iv. 7.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1877, by
SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.
COPYRIGHT, 1905,
BY GEORGE P. FISHER.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THE NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY AND ITS RELATION TO THE JEWISH AND HEATHEN RELIGIONS 1

CHAPTER II.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE AS A PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY . 40

CHAPTER III.

THE POPULAR RELIGION OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS . . 74

CHAPTER IV.

THE POPULAR RELIGION OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS AND ITS DECLINE 112

CHAPTER V.

THE GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY . 140

CHAPTER VI.

THE STATE OF MORALS IN ANCIENT HEATHEN SOCIETY . . 191

CHAPTER VII.

THE SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE JEWS AT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST 221

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIRST EVANGELICAL RECORDS: THE GOSPELS OF MARK AND OF MATTHEW 258

CHAPTER IX.

THE WRITINGS OF LUKE 286

CHAPTER X.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN 320

CHAPTER XI.

WATER-MARKS OF AGE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT HISTORIES . 363

CHAPTER XII.

THE CRITICAL TREATMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT HISTORIES 390

CHAPTER XIII.

JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE BEGINNING OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS 416

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PLAN OF JESUS AND HIS MEANS OF ACCOMPLISHING IT . 441

CHAPTER XV.

THE SEPARATION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE TEMPLE . . 469

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE . . 506

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST CENTURY 546

TO

EDWARDS AMASA PARK

AS A TOKEN OF RESPECT FOR HIS SERVICES

IN PROMOTING THEOLOGICAL SCIENCE

AND OF GRATITUDE FOR PERSONAL KINDNESS

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED

BY THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

In this volume—which is founded on a Course of Lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute, in Boston, in February and March, 1876—I have undertaken, first, to describe the ancient Roman world, including both Heathen and Jewish Society, into which Christianity entered, and in which it first established itself; secondly, to examine the New Testament documents from which our knowledge of the beginnings of the Christian religion must be derived; and thirdly, to discuss some of the most important topics connected with the Life of Jesus and the Apostolic Age. The title given to the Lectures was the "Rise of Christianity and its Historical Environment," the last term being borrowed from the students of natural science; but finding that this title, although a good equivalent for my own conception, needed explanation, I have exchanged it for one expressed in plainer words.

Under the first of the heads above named, in addition to the preparation for Christianity which was furnished, in a more external way, by the unification of mankind under the Roman Empire, I have dwelt upon the less familiar but more deeply interesting branch of the topic—the mental and moral preparation for the Gospel, which was partly the result of the Roman polity, but which flowed, also, from the entire development of the ancient religion and philosophy. I should be glad to inspire my readers with the interest which I feel in this portion of the subject, especially in tracing the affinities between the noblest products of the poetry and philosophy of Antiquity and the Christian faith. The best of the Fathers

discerned so clearly the peculiarity of the Gospel, and the short-comings of Philosophy even in its best estate, that they did not fear to recognize the large measure of truth which heathen sages had embodied in their writings. Justin Martyr tells us that Christ was known in part to Socrates, he being enlightened by the Word.[1] Augustine was roused from sensuality and ambition by "the incredible ardor" which was kindled in his mind by a passage in the "Hortensius" of Cicero on the worth and dignity of philosophy, and burned, as he says, "to remount from earthly things to God."[2] He affirms that Christianity is as old as the creation.[3] He speaks very often of the near approach of Platonism to Christian doctrine;[4] yet he does not find in the Platonic writings a way of salvation: "No one hears Christ call, in these books—'Come unto me all ye that labor.'"[5] When we pass within the circle of Revealed Religion, and mark the divine training of the Hebrew People, in its successive stages, we understand how it is true that "Salvation is of the Jews." In the introductory chapter, I have dealt with this topic, and have illustrated the manner in which, as I conceive, the gradually developing character of Revelation contains a solution of moral difficulties in the Old Testament.

In the second division of the work, I have to take the reader into the field of New Testament criticism. It is necessary to investigate the origin and credibility of the New Testament histories, in the light of modern researches and controversies.[6] I must leave it to others to judge of the degree of candor and thoroughness with which the investigations under this head have been pursued. No one who has kept up with the German literature in this province can fail to have observed that the

[1] Apol. ii. 10. [2] Confess., iii. 7. [3] Retractt., I. xiii. 3.
[4] E. g., de vera Religione, 3. [5] Confess., vii. 27.
[6] In a former work, (*Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity*, 1865; 3d ed., 1870), some of these questions were considered. In the present volume nothing is reproduced from that work; but I have taken the liberty occasionally to refer to it for a more full discussion of certain special topics.

ground taken by the Tübingen school respecting the "tendency," or theological bias, of the first two Gospels, and of the writings of Luke, is not now maintained by critics of an independent spirit, such as Reuss, Holtzmann, and Mangold. Is it too much to believe that a similar retrogression may be expected in the case of the Fourth Gospel? The two great critical questions are the credibility of the Acts, and the authorship of this Gospel. On the first of these questions, as it appears to me, the most enlightened criticism is moving steadily towards a general recognition of the trustworthiness of Luke. Respecting the Fourth Gospel, there are no present signs of an approaching unanimity of judgment. For one, I cannot bring myself to believe that this Gospel was manufactured by a Christian believer early in the second century, and palmed off on the churches of Asia where John had lived and died. For the attempt of Keim and Scholten to drive the Apostle out of Asia can only be considered as a desperate expedient to escape a conclusion which seems inevitable from the fact of his having lived and taught there. While I reject the extreme positions of the Tübingen school, I should be the last to deny that, directly or indirectly, by its agency, and especially by the labors of the late Dr. Baur, a flood of light has been thrown upon the New Testament period. What life and movement there was in the Apostolic age! What momentous questions were agitated among the Apostles themselves! What a progress of doctrine among them! And how wide of the mark, in many particulars, is the popular apprehension of the opening era!

After having formed a judgment of the character and value of the original documents, the way is open for the consideration of certain main points in the life and ministry of Jesus, together with the leading events in the Apostolic age. The chapters under this head conclude with a description of the characteristic features of early Christianity.

In prosecuting the studies, the results of which are included in this volume, I have resorted to the primary sources; and I

venture to hope that, here and there, especially in the part relating to the New Testament writings and their contents, I have been able to set forth some points in a somewhat clearer light than has been done heretofore. Where I have been assisted by the labors of others, it is little to say that I have exercised an independent judgment, and have tested statements and opinions by the evidence on which they claim to rest. I wish, however, to give full credit to the modern writers to whom I am most indebted. Upon the Greek religion I am under large obligations to the excellent treatises of Nägelsbach on the Homeric and Post-homeric Theology.[1] Although I have been guided by him, to a considerable extent, even in the order of topics, yet it is proper to say that in almost all cases, the illustrative passages from the ancient authors were selected by myself, in my own reading.[2] Upon the history of the Jews, and their social and religious life, I must, first, gratefully own my indebtedness to Ewald. His faults—his arrogant temper in relation to other scholars, and the dogmatic tone in which unverified conjectures are put on a level with demonstrated truth — lie on the surface, and are patent to all. But not less obvious are his profound and exact learning, with which is blended a rare ability to seize on comprehensive points of view, and, I will add, his unaffected piety. I have derived aid from the recent German works on the contemporary history of the times of Christ. Hausrath I have consulted with profit, although I differ widely from his critical views; but the condensed, lucid, and

[1] Die homerische Theologie in ihrem Zusammenhange dargestellt, von Carl Friedrich Nägelsbach, 1840. Die nachhomerische Theologie des griechisch. Volks-glaubens bis auf Alexander, dargestellt von Dr. Karl Friedrich Nägelsbach, Prof. d. Philolog. zu Erlangen. 1857.

[2] The extracts from Homer are given from Mr. Bryant's translation; those from Æschylus and Sophocles from the translations by Mr. Plumptre; and the passages from Plato are cited from Prof. Jowett's version (the ed. in 4 vols., 1861). But I have usually given the original text of the ancient authors, for the benefit of those who prefer to translate for themselves.

thorough work of Schürer,[1] which confines itself to the Jews, I have found of great service. Derenbourg, among others, has supplied me with information from Rabbinical sources. Gfrörer has been useful upon the subject of the Jewish Theology in the time of Christ. I have not neglected the modern Hebrew scholars, Jost, Grätz, Herzfeld, Geiger, and others. On various points of Jewish history I have referred with advantage to Milman, and to the graphic pages of Stanley. As to Roman customs and manners, I owe most to the compact and well-digested treatise of Friedländer.[2] Although I cannot always follow him to the full extent, in his judgments respecting ancient society, where they depart from the usual opinions, I have drawn freely from the invaluable store of facts which he has collected. As regards the Reforms of Augustus, the work of M. Boissier on the Roman Religion from Augustus to the Antonines, has been of advantage. The *Histoire des Theories et des Idées Morales dans l'Antiquité*, of M. Denis, has brought to my attention certain aspects of this subject which, without its aid, I might have overlooked. When a student in Germany I translated, and published in an American Journal,[3] an Essay of Neander on the Relation of Grecian to Christian ethics.[4] That Essay, more than anything else, has stimulated me to the study of Greek Philosophy in this particular relation, and some of its thoughts will no doubt be found in the chapter on that subject.

With respect to the critical discussions upon the New Testament books, and upon the early Christian history, I have not undertaken to make references to the copious literature any farther than was absolutely needful. It seemed undesirable to do

[1] Lehrbuch d. Neutestamentl. Zeitgeschichte, von Dr. Emil Schürer, A. o. Prof. d. Theol. zu Leipzig. 1874.

[2] Darstellungen aus d. Sittengeschichte Roms in d. Zeit von August bis zum Ausgang d. Antonine. Von Ludwig Friedländer, Professor in Königsberg. Th. i. (ed. 4), 1873; Th. ii. (ed. 3), 1874; Th. iii. (1871).

[3] Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. x.

[4] Wissenchaftl. Abhandlungen, von Dr. August Neander, pp. 140-214. (1851.)

more in this direction, as I have written, not for scholars and ministers alone, but also for the cultivated public who are interested in such inquiries. Besides, the best works on the Introduction to the New Testament supply this information, and the student has access to the accurate and exhaustive bibliographical Articles of Professor Abbot, in the American edition of Smith's Bible Dictionary. It gives me pleasure to express the obligations I am under to the writings of Professor Lightfoot. The frequent references which I have naturally been led to make to them, indicate better than any words of eulogy can do, my appreciation of the scholarship, candor, and critical tact which characterize them. Those who have long been accustomed to look to the Germans to lead the way in these studies must hail with peculiar satisfaction the appearance, in our own language, of works of so high merit. The writings of Lightfoot, Westcott, Ellicott, Jowett, Stanley, Discussions like those of Mr. Hutton and of Mr. Sanday upon the Fourth Gospel, even the Essays of Matthew Arnold, unsatisfactory as many of the opinions expressed in them may be, and the anonymous work entitled "Supernatural Religion," which reproduces the most extreme theories of the Tübingen School, all indicate that the barren age of English Theology, in the department of Criticism, is fast drawing to a close.

It remains for me to make my grateful acknowledgments to my friends, Mr. W. L. Kingsley, and Professor L. R. Packard of Yale College, for the assistance which they have given me while this volume has been passing through the press.

New Haven, September, 1877.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

WITH A VIEW OF THE STATE OF THE ROMAN WORLD AT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE OF CHRISTIANITY AND ITS RELATION TO THE JEWISH AND HEATHEN RELIGIONS.

CHRISTIANITY is an historical religion. It is made up of events, or, to say the least, springs out of events which, however peculiar in their origin, form a part of the history of mankind. This characteristic of Christianity is suggested on the first page of the New Testament, where we find the genealogy of Jesus carried back, through David, to Abraham, the progenitor of the Hebrew nation. The Evangelist Luke, a Gentile by birth, sets his narrative in connection with universal history. He tells us that "in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea," Herod and others ruling in Palestine and the adjacent districts, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests at Jerusalem, there began the series of events which he proposes to record.[1] He will describe transactions that took place, at a definite epoch, in a particular province of the Roman Empire. And the lineage of Jesus he follows back to Adam.[2] The Apostle Paul refers to the birth of Christ as having occurred "when the fulness of time was come."[3] His thought evidently is,

[1] Luke iii. 1, 2. [2] Luke iii. 38. [3] Gal. iv. 4.

not only that a certain measure of time must run out, but that a train of historical events and changes must occur which have the coming of Christ for their proper sequence. Of the nature of these antecedents in the previous course of history, he speaks when he has occasion to discuss the relation of the Mosaic dispensation to the Christian, and to point out the aims of Providence in regard to the Gentile nations. It was formerly a mistake of both Orthodox and Rationalist to look upon Christianity too exclusively as a system of doctrine addressed to the understanding. Revelation has been thought of as a communication written on high, and let down from the skies,—delivered to men as the Sibylline books were said to have been conveyed to Tarquin. Or, it has been considered, like the philosophical system of Plato, a creation of the human intellect, busying itself with the problems of life and destiny: the tacit assumption in either case being that Christianity is merely a body of doctrine. The truth is that Revelation is at the core historical. It is embraced in a series of transactions in which men act and participate, but which are referable manifestly to an extraordinary agency of God, who thus discloses, or reveals Himself. The supernatural element does not exclude the natural; miracle is not magic. Over and above teaching, there are laws, institutions, providential guidance, deliverance, and judgment. Here is the ground-work of Revelation. For the interpretation of this extraordinary and exceptional line of historical phenomena, prophets and apostles are raised up,—men inspired to lift the veil and explain the dealings of heaven with men. Here is the doctrinal or theoretical side of Revelation. These individuals behold with an open eye the significance of the events of which they are witnesses, or participants. The facts of secular history require to be illuminated by philosophy. Analogous to this office

of philosophy, is the authoritative exposition and comment which we find in the Scriptures along with the historical record. The doctrinal element is not a thing independent, purely theoretic, disconnected from the realities of life and history. These lie at the foundation; on them everything of a didactic nature is based. This fact will be impressively obvious to one who will compare the Bible, as to plan and structure, with the Koran.

The character of Revelation is less likely to be misconceived when the design of Revelation is kept in view. The end is not to satisfy the curiosity of those who "seek after wisdom," by the solution of metaphysical problems. The good offered is not science, but salvation. The final cause of Revelation is the recovery of men to communion with God; that is, to true religion. Whatever knowledge is communicated is tributary to this end.

Hence the grand aim, under the Old Dispensation and the New, was, not the production of a Book, but the training of a people. To raise up and train up a nation that should become a fit instrument for the moral regeneration of mankind was the aim of the old system. A deep consciousness of this high providential design connected with them as a people, pervades the Hebrew mind from the beginning. In the darkest hours of their national history, this conviction bursts forth in the exultant strains of prophecy. The purpose of Providence might be imperfectly understood, crudely defined, especially in the earlier ages; it might even engender pride and narrowness, and be turned into a spring of fanaticism; yet it was a great, inspiring faith, and has been justified by the history of mankind down to the present hour. The Hebrew people were in the end fitted for the office which, even in the far-distant past, they had expected to fulfill.

Under the new or Christian system, the object was not

less the training of a people; not, however, with any limitations of race. The fruit of the system was to be a community of men who should be "the light of the world," and "the salt of the earth."

The Scriptures which, when collected into a volume, are called the Bible, are the records and monuments of this long process of divine training. They are the original documents through which we get an authentic knowledge of this historical process in its consecutive stages. Whether narratives, devotional lyrics, ethical treatises, the fervid utterances of prophets, or the didactic and admonitory letters of Apostles,—the compilation of these writings into a volume was not included in the intention of their several authors. These wrote, as they were moved to write, under the pressure of the circumstances that surrounded them; in some cases to meet special exigencies, in all cases for the particular benefit of those to whom their compositions were delivered. In the growth of the Bible the providential design outran the thoughts and purposes of the individual writers.

The grand idea of the kingdom of God is the connecting thread that runs through the entire course of divine Revelation. We behold a kingdom, planted in the remote past, and carried forward to its ripe development, by a series of transactions in which the agency of God mingles in an altogether peculiar way in the current of human affairs. There is a manifestation of God in act and deed. Verbal teaching is the commentary attached to the historic fact, ensuring to the latter its true meaning. For example, the emancipation of the Israelites from bondage in Egypt was the standing illustration of the character of God, who revealed Himself in that act, and the symbol of the great redemption from sin, itself not less an act and achievement than the event which prefigured it. All Apostolic doctrine

is the exposition of the events of the Gospel history—an unveiling of their true import.

The historical basis of Christianity marks the distinction between Christian theology and metaphysical philosophy. The starting-point of the philosopher is the intuitions of the mind: on them as a foundation, with the aid of logic, he builds up his system. His only postulates are the data of consciousness. In Christian theology, on the contrary, we begin with facts recorded in history, and explore, with the aid of inspired authors, their rationale. To reverse this course, and seek to evolve the Christian religion out of consciousness, to transmute its contents into a speculative system, after the manner of the Pantheistic thinkers in Germany, is not less futile than would be the pretence to construct American history with no reference to the Puritan emigration, the Revolutionary war, or the Southern Rebellion. The distinctive essence of Christianity evaporates in an effort like that undertaken by Schelling in his earlier system, and by Hegel, to identify it with a process of thought.

Christianity stands in organic connection with the Old Testament religion, both being parts of a gradually developing system.

Of the Hebrew people, Ewald writes: "The history of this ancient people is, at the foundation, the history of the true religion passing through all the stages of progress by which it attained to its consummation; the religion which, on this narrow territory, advances through all struggles to complete victory, and at length reveals itself in its full glory and might, to the end that, spreading abroad by its own irresistible energy, it may never vanish away, but may become the eternal heritage and blessing of all nations."[1]

[1] Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, i. 9.

The Christian religion does not profess to spring from an absolutely new and independent beginning. The very name "Christ" is an Old Testament title. The Founder of Christianity, and his immediate followers, were Jews,—earnest believers in the doctrine of Moses and the prophets. For all that they did and taught, they claimed some kind of warrant in the Old Testament Scriptures, which they constantly cited. We have scanty information relative to the childhood and youth of Jesus; but there can be no doubt that the one book in his hands, the one book that, more than any other external influence, evoked within him the consciousness of his peculiar relation to God, and office among men, was the Old Testament. As he brooded over its contents, this consciousness, indistinct in his earliest years, gradually assumed the clearness and certainty of an intuition. When he would declare to his own townsmen at Nazareth who he was, and what his work was to be, he took in his hand the roll of the Prophet Isaiah, and read a passage from it.[1] The New Testament is steeped in the Old. The Greek of the New Testament is tinged throughout with the Hebrew idiom, and betrays, in matter as well as in style, on every page, the influence of the ancient books. "Salvation is of the Jews."[2]

It is equally true, however, that Christianity is an advance upon the Old Testament religion. It is a further step in the progress of Revelation. What mischief has resulted from overlooking this truth, and from treating the earlier and later dispensations as in all respects on a level! The Mosaic legislation has been sometimes considered a perfect model for political communities to follow, in Christian times. Religious intolerance has appealed in self-defence to Hebrew enactments. But the Old Testament religion was an imperfect, because an inchoate system. It

[1] Luke iv. 16–31. [2] John iv. 22.

was rudimental, introductory to something better, by which it was eventually to be superseded. The Kingdom of God existed at the outset in a national form, in the form of a theocratic state. A civil community was established, to which God assumed the relation of a law-giver. Civil, moral, and religious enactments—statutes framed to meet temporary needs and conditions, and laws which have an unchangeable validity—were mingled indiscriminately in one code, the design being to set the entire life in a direct relation to God, and to train a single people in the elements of true religion. In this nascent form of the Kingdom of God, an externality belonged to it which it was destined to outgrow, and finally to shuffle off. Taking our stand back at the organization of the theocracy, we can see how the two diverse elements that coalesce in its structure, must inevitably dissolve their unity, and we can divine the struggles that must eventually arise from the conflict of these elements, and from the imperfect discernment of their mutual relations. There was, on the one hand, the political, national element, local and limited in its very nature; and, on the other hand, there was the element of religion and the doctrine of God, in its nature universal and impartial. When the time shall come for this element to burst the bonds that confine it, will the local and temporary polity be ready to give way? Will not men cling to it as an end in itself? The whole history of Israel is the record of the expansion of the germ of pure religion, until the time should come for it to separate completely from the entanglements of the theocratic polity.

It is plain that the religious consciousness, or the general type of religious ideas and feelings, rises higher and higher as we pass from one epoch to another of Hebrew history. Only by degrees did that which was latent in the relation assumed by God towards men come to the light.

How scanty and indistinct are the references to a future life in the earlier books of the Old Testament! Sheol, the realm of the dead, is a dark, gloomy, subterranean abode, a land of shadows and forgetfulness. Advancing to a later age, we find in some of the Psalms brighter hopes for the righteous, and retribution anticipated for the wicked. In the canonical books written last, immortality and the resurrection are distinctly asserted. The rewards and punishments of the law were temporal. The sense of a moral government was kept alive by visible allotments of justice, within the circle of earthly experience.

The Messianic expectation, the great prophetic feature of the Old Testament, emerges from a vague presentiment into a definite and concrete form. It is like a vast object seen far off in a mist, which acquires definite outline the nearer it is approached. As the ideal of the kingdom expanded before the imagination of poet and seer, the conception of the Messiah, through whom the ideal was to be realized, gained a corresponding development.

Every one sees that the Prophets stand on a higher mount of vision than belonged to the age of Moses. In Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, a broad view is taken of the providential plan, in which the mighty Powers then on the stage—Assyria, Babylon, Egypt, Persia—play each an appointed part. We have the beginning of a philosophy of history, from the right point of view, where the Kingdom of God is made the final cause of the rise and fall of empires. There is, moreover, a more vivid discernment of the spirituality of religion. A sharp line of discrimination is drawn between moral and ceremonial enactments. This is a step in advance of the Mosaic Revelation. Ceremonies and outward services are relegated to a subordinate place. No more scorching denunciations of formalism in religion were ever poured out from human lips. Pure affections

and righteous conduct are what Jehovah demands: He delights "not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats."[1]

In like manner, the religious consciousness of the Mosaic period is perceptibly in advance of that of the primitive era of which we have glimpses in the Patriarchal traditions that form the Prolegomena to the Mosaic legislation. It is evident that a book having the characteristics of Job must have been composed much later than the date of these traditions. The problems which are agitated in this book belong to an age of reflection. It would be an anachronism to put them in the primeval times.[2] A book like Ecclesiastes evidently falls much later than Job. It belongs chronologically in the third and final section of the Hebrew canon.

The Hebrew Scriptures themselves point forward to an epoch when the Old Testament system is to resolve itself into something higher. The words of John the Baptist, "He must increase, but I must decrease,"[3] indicate the feeling that belonged to the highest representatives of the Old Economy. It was felt to be the forerunner of a more perfect system. What other religion ever foretold its own disappearance? It is true that there was felt to be a permanent, as well as a transient element in the religion of Israel. It was never to be utterly thrown aside, like a worn-out garment. There was a life in it that would never become extinct. The distinct foresight of what was to follow was not possible to the vision of prophecy. When the Prophets depicted the future destiny of the Old Testament religion, they could not so far transport themselves beyond their age as to discriminate precisely between what was to endure and what was to vanish away. Hence Jeremiah

[1] Isa. i. 11. [2] See Bleek, *Einl. in d. A. T.*, p. 659.
[3] John iii. 30.

declares that a man shall never be wanting to sit on the throne of David, nor Levites to offer sacrifices on the altar.[1] "The Jew," observes Dr. Payne Smith, "could only use such symbols as he possessed, and in describing the perfectness of the Christian Church, was compelled to represent it as the state of things under which he lived, freed from all imperfections."[2] Nevertheless he beheld in the dim future a momentous crisis and revolution, when, in a manner that he could but imperfectly portray, old things were to pass away, and a new order of things was to arise in their place. Had it been granted to an ancient prophet to foresee the rapidity of modern travelling, it is too much to expect of him that he should describe the steam-engine; he would picture to himself the end as attained by a preternatural perfection given to the steeds and vehicles with which his eyes were familiar. A more full and literal prediction would imply that the goal had already been reached. The Prophet Jeremiah, in another place, standing on the pinnacle of Old Testament inspiration, predicts a mighty change in religion: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." The covenant made at the Exodus, proclaimed at Sinai, is to be superseded by one of a different nature. "This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people." This is the first characteristic of the new covenant: the law is to be converted from an outward statute into a transforming principle. And the second characteristic is expressed in

[1] Jer. xxxiii. 18.

[2] "Speaker's Commentary," *in loco.*

the words: "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."[1] The free forgiveness of sin is to take the place of the infliction of penalty. These two cardinal features are to distinguish the new charter, in comparison with the old. The outward spread of the kingdom is equally an object of glowing anticipation. "There shall be an handful of corn in the earth upon the top of the mountains; the fruit thereof shall shake like Lebanon."[2] If the coming glory of the kingdom was sometimes figured under the symbols of the Davidic monarchy, spreading its conquests among the heathen, and of the sanctuary at Jerusalem attracting the most remote nations to worship within its walls, this, again, was an unavoidable limitation imposed upon the prophetic mind. It must frame its visions out of materials within the circle of experience. It was true of the most illuminated of the prophets, as Ewald says, that, "as soon as they ventured on more explicit indications of the form which the future would take, they were unable to think of it except as linking itself to that spot on which the sanctity of the true religion had already obtained an abiding seat and a distinct shape for so many centuries; for the imagination of the true Prophet never loses itself in shapeless and unsupported visions."[3]

That Christianity is a higher stage in a process of revelation, the New Testament leaves us no room to doubt. Christianity did not confine itself to the mere reform of a traditional system which had fallen into degeneracy. Rather was it claimed that, in the Gospel, Revelation was carried far above the level which it reached at the purest epoch of Judaism. It was indeed a reform, but it was something more. It was affirmed that while, among all the worthies of the Old Testament, no greater personage had appeared than John the Baptist, the least in the kingdom

[1] Jer. xxxi. 31–35. [2] Ps. lxxii. 16. [3] Geschichte, iv. 43.

of heaven, which was now to burst through its confined, theocratic form, was greater than he. The least disciple of Jesus was lifted above John by standing on a higher plane of divine revelation. The imperfection of Old Testament law in comparison with Christian ethics is taught by Christ. He set his precepts in direct contrast with what had been said to them "of old time."[1] When He was consulted on the subject of divorce, and reference was made to the legislation of Moses, which permitted a husband to discard a wife by going through certain formalities, Jesus said that the Mosaic law on this matter had been accommodated to the hardness of men's hearts.[2] It had been adapted to the obtuse moral perceptions prevalent at the time when it was given, and thus fell short of the ideal of morality. This memorable statement illustrates the remark of Herder that the defects of the Old Testament are those of the pupil and not of the teacher. The law of Moses went as far as it was practicable to go, in view of the debased condition of the people. To have attempted more would have been to accomplish nothing. The law of Moses was a good beginning. It called for an improvement upon the existing practice. It laid a degree of restraint upon lawless passion and caprice. It was a license in form, but a restriction in reality. But it did not, and could not, embody the true idea of the conjugal relation, as that idea lay at the beginning in the Creator's mind. The New Testament law on this subject was the fulfilment of the Levitical rule.

Moral difficulties in the Old Testament, both in its teaching, and in the recorded actions of good men, are in many cases removed by an application of the truth included in this pregnant declaration of Jesus respecting a single topic of duty. The doctrine of the ethical superiority of the Gospel to the Mosaic system is a plain inference from it. The

[1] Matt. v. 21, 27, 33, 38, 43. [2] Matt. xix. 8; Mark x. 5.

heroes of the Old Covenant who are named with honor by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[1] are men whose conduct was often repugnant to the standard of the Gospel. Of some of them it has been said that were they living now, in a civilized Christian state, they would be lodged in the penitentiary. Rahab and Samson, Gideon and Jephthah, are names that look strange when placed in the same category with the Evangelist John. It is enough to say that they did not live in the light of the Gospel. We do not expect men to see as well at midnight as at noonday. At a period of barbarism and wild anarchy, they had a faith in the Invisible, and a fidelity induced by it, which have an imperishable worth. They espoused the right side in a conflict on the issue of which was staked the weal of all future generations. The historic movement which they, often in a rough way, but at the cost of peril and sacrifice, helped forward, was in the right direction. Men must be judged in relation to their times. There are paintings produced in the infancy of Art, which elicit sympathy, for the intent out of which they spring, and for the sentiment beneath them which struggles for expression, though the materials are crude, and the execution very imperfect. Thus it is with the moral and religious element that shines out even in the dark ages of Hebrew history. The general aim may be right, when the means chosen to reach it are the fruit of an uneducated moral sense. We must approach these ancient records in a catholic spirit, and with the same historic sense that we apply in judging the mediæval crusader, or the soldiers of Cromwell. When the heart of Clovis, the chief of the Franks, had been touched by Christian teaching, and he listened to the story of the crucifixion, as told to him by the venerable Remigius, the Bishop of Rheims, he cried out: "Had I only been there with my

[1] Heb. xi.

Franks, I would have taught those Jews a better lesson!"[1] It was the impulse of the impetuous disciple who drew his sword in the Garden. The act may be rebuked, but not the warm devotion, the honest though unenlightened zeal, that prompted it.

The principle of "the gradualness and partialness" of divine Revelation helps to explain events in Hebrew history which otherwise are perplexing. The invasion and partial extermination of the Canaanites is one of these. Let us suppose for a moment that this had taken place, without an explicit command, under the ordinary Providence of God. Not only do we find in history that men are indiscriminately destroyed by pestilence and earthquake; but that migration and conquest are means providentially employed for bringing retribution upon nations sunk in corruption, and for planting the seeds of a better form of society. Suppose, then, that the Israelites, after their liberation from bondage, and their wanderings in the desert, animated, to use the language of Ewald, with the newly-roused energy of a unanimous faith in God, attacked the idolatrous tribes of Palestine, the worshippers of Baal, Astarte, and Moloch—names fitly adopted by Milton for the chiefs of Pandemonium—put a multitude of them to the sword, and drove the remainder, with the "human sacrifices and licentious orgies" of their religion, to the northern sea-coast of the country. Suppose that the natural and rational dread of the seductions of idolatry moved the best of them—their leaders—to insist upon a wholesale destruction and expulsion of the inhabitants, whose iniquities they abhorred; the intent being to isolate the worshippers of Jehovah from the contamination of heathenism. Two things, at least, are plain. The crusade sprang out of religious impulses. It was not personal vindictiveness; however congenial the

[1] Neander, *Church History*, iii. 8.

way of prosecuting the contest may have been with the barbarous methods of waging war then in vogue. And the alternative was rightly understood; it was either an unrelenting hostility, or a compromise and a mingling of the Hebrews and idolaters, which must have resulted in the extinguishment of the light of truth, dim as it was, of which the former were possessed. Had the world been different from what it was, had the Hebrews been different —more firm in their faith, more enlightened—the alternative would not have existed. But it did exist; and the preservation of true religion in its germs, our Christian civilization to-day, are dependent upon the course that was actually taken, revolting as it would be to humane feeling, if repeated at a later day, and under altered circumstances. Had the Canaanites been spared, the historic stream, narrow and turbid as it then was, would have been choked up, or turned out of its channel, instead of flowing on in a broader and clearer current, until, at a point far remote from its source, it issued in a pure Christian theism, the life of our civilization.

All this is clear to the historical student, whatever may be his creed, who values the Christian religion, and discerns the genetic connection of events. We must conclude that the extirpation of the Canaanites, the only means by which the contagion of their idolatry and sensuality could be avoided—"terrible surgery" though it was, to borrow language of Carlyle in speaking of another matter—was yet a part of the wise and beneficent order of Providence. We must conclude, also, that it was the fruit of the highest religious impulses of the people who were charged with the seed of what is most precious in modern religion and civilization. Were this the whole case, we should have to say that the excesses springing from the untamed religious zeal of an uncivilized people, were overruled by Providence,

educing good out of partial evil, in subservience to a far-sighted plan for the salvation of the human race. But if we bring in, as an additional element, the manifested will of God, as the warrant for their proceeding, they are raised to the level of executioners, not merely of a permissive, providential appointment, but of a direct commandment. It becomes an instance where human agency is employed for the infliction of divine judgment, the agent consciously acting as the instrument of divine justice.

How can such a commandment, enjoining indiscriminate massacre, be consistent with the divine attributes?

As far as the consequences are concerned, the destruction of life, there is no greater difficulty than exists in the case of a hurricane or a plague, which sweeps away myriads of both sexes and of all ages.

As far as the effect upon the actors is concerned, there is no offence done to the moral sense; there is no such departure from the common ideas, the accepted laws of war and conquest in that age, as would produce a moral deterioration in the Israelites themselves. Rather is it true, that feeling themselves to be deputies of the Supreme Power for the execution of penalties, and for the carrying out of a plan not their own, they would perform their stern work with a kind of sacred enthusiasm, unlike the base feeling of malice and revenge, as for a private injury, and impressed at every step with their own exposure to a like retribution in case they trod in the path of those whom they were commanded to destroy.

If they were used as a flail and a scourge, the victims of their hostility suffered no heavier calamity than has been visited by the will of Providence upon many a corrupt and enervated nation, which has been crushed under the foot of the invader; while for the Israelites themselves a wall was built up around them against the pollutions of heathen-

ism, and a sense of the guilt and peril of apostacy was gained, which their whole subsequent history proves that they could not afford to spare.

Yet it may be said that the commandment took the form that it did take on account of "the hardness of their hearts." Had they been more susceptible to the influence of gentler motives, less inclined to the debasing rites of idolatry, and had their moral sense been capable of discriminations which are easy to an educated conscience—in a word, had they stood upon a higher spiritual plane, the injunction might have been different. It might then have been as safe for them to mingle with the heathen as it was in the later ages of their history, when no enticements and no terrors could move them to take part in idolatry.

When the Israelites seized upon the mountains of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, and dispossessed their inhabitants at the edge of the sword, the divine behest by which they were impelled, evinced, both in its motive and in its form, the imperfect morality of the chosen people. The motive was to seclude them from the corruptions of idolatry; its form was accommodated to that low stage of moral discernment, where the guilt of the individual is conceived of as extending its pollution to the family and the clan, and where the obligation of love is limited by the boundaries of kinship. The evils inflicted were such as God has a right to inflict by human agency, and such as He does thus inflict in the course of His Providence; the agents in the infliction of them acted up to the full level of conscientious feeling to which they had attained. They did no violence to any moral instinct.[1] The supernatural ele-

[1] This solution of the problem suggested by the Wars of Extermination, recorded in the Bible as undertaken by divine command, does not differ in the essential points from that offered by Dr. Mozly in "The Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, and their relation to Old Testament Faith,"—a work which I have examined since these pages were written.

ment—the inspiration—that animated the Israelites to their crusade, is not more responsible for the imperfect morality of their conduct, than if that conduct had sprung altogether from their own undeveloped moral sense. Is it asked, what then is the advantage of inspiration and supernatural guidance, if they go no farther in lifting the recipients above the level of natural conscience? The answer is that the test of a gradual Revelation is not its preliminary stages, but its final outcome.[1]

He says: "It seems to belong suitably to the Divine Governor of the world, to extract out of every state of mankind, the highest and most noble acts to which the special conceptions of the age can give rise, and direct those earlier ideas and modes of thinking, toward such great moral achievements as are able to be founded upon them," (pp. 55, 56). "A divine command to undertake a war of extermination could only, to begin with, necessarily have been a command by condescension to the defect in the state of man's moral perceptions in that age." "What it [the command] starts from is the evil in man, and not the perfect good in the divine will," (p. 159). "That dispensation starts with the sanction of a class of actions, which could not be done by an enlightened people with full and mature moral perception," (p. 170).

[1] This truth is well presented by Dr. Mozly in the last chapter of his *Moral Ideas*, etc.,—"The End the Test of a Progressive Revelation." (Lect. x.)

Bishop Butler has the following interesting passage:

"Indeed, there are some particular precepts in Scripture, given to particular persons, requiring actions, which would be immoral and vicious, were it not for such precepts. But it is easy to see, that all these are of such a kind, as that the precept changes the whole nature of the case, and of the action; and both constitutes and shows that not to be unjust or immoral, which, prior to the precept, must have appeared and really have been so; which may well be, since none of these precepts are contrary to immutable morality. If it were commanded to cultivate the principles, and act from the spirit of treachery, ingratitude, cruelty; the command would not alter the nature of the case, or of the action in any of these instances. But it is quite otherwise in precepts which require only the doing an external action; for instance, taking away the property or life of any. For men have no right to either life or property, but what arises solely from the grant of God. When this

Each successive epoch in the progress of the ancient Revelation was attended with a corresponding development of religious and ethical ideas. Not only conduct, but also doctrinal and devotional utterances are homogeneous with the particular era in which they are found. The inspiration of prophets affords but a partial disclosure of truth; it does not escape the limitations of time and situation. In the stormy period of the Judges, Deborah the Prophetess

grant is revoked, they cease to have any rights at all in either. And though a course of external acts, which without command would be immoral, must make an immoral habit, yet a few detached commands have no such natural tendency. I thought proper to say thus much of the few Scripture precepts, which require not vicious actions, but actions which would have been vicious, had it not been for such precepts; because they are sometimes weakly urged as immoral, and great weight is laid upon objections drawn from them. But to me there seems no difficulty at all in these precepts, but what arises from their being offences; *i. e.*, from their being liable to be perverted, as indeed they are, by wicked, designing men, to serve the most horrid purposes, and perhaps, to mislead the weak and enthusiastic." *Analogy*, Part ii. Ch. iii. Mr. Grote, in comments on this passage, in a note in his work on Plato (Vol. iii. pp. 394, 395), appears to think that a conservative Greek, on the same grounds, might have defended the obnoxious acts and commands of his divinities against one who would take them as examples for his own conduct. But Mr. Grote's remarks involve several fallacies. The first is that they overlook the fact that the revocation of the grant of life and property by the Deity, in the cases supposed by Butler, is considered to be based on justice, and to be a part of a wise scheme of general government; whereas in the case of the myths in question, the gods act manifestly from caprice, lust, and other obviously selfish passions. The inference to be drawn as to the character of the objects of worship in each case is plain. Then, secondly, Butler implies that the precepts to which he refers are *shown* to be the sole warrant of the particular acts which they enjoin. They are so shown by the circumstances under which they are given, and—what is here specially worthy of note—by subsequent revelations concerning human duties. Thus, these special commands are on a level with the injunctions of a magistrate to his deputies to take property or life, which these individuals, without the authority derived from the commands, would not think themselves to have a right to do.

chanted a song of triumph over the fallen enemies of Israel. In this song, we read: "Blessed above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be."[1] Jael had treacherously slain Sisera whom she had decoyed into her tent. No argument is needed to show the inconsistency of such an act with the precepts of Christianity. Yet it receives from the mouth of a Prophetess the most distinguished praise. The motive of the act was a high and unselfish one; the deed which sprang from it was wrong, though ignorantly done. "If we can overlook the treachery and violence which belonged to the morals of the age and country, and bear in mind Jael's ardent sympathies with the oppressed people of God, her faith in the right of Israel to possess the land in which they were now slaves, her zeal for the glory of Jehovah as against the gods of Canaan, and the heroic courage and firmness with which she executed her deadly purpose, we shall be ready to yield her the praise which is her due."[2] "Deborah speaks of Jael's deed by the light of her own age, which did not make manifest the evil of guile and bloodshed; the light in ours does."[3] What shall be said, in the light of the Gospel, of Deborah's applause of Jael? It is merited if applied to the motive; it is misplaced when directed to the act. The act was right "according to that dispensation," where "love your friend and hate your enemy" was the highest recognized rule of conduct. Deborah was cognizant of no broader rule of morality.[4]

Nowhere do the deepest emotions of the religious mind find so pathetic an expression as in the Psalms. Yet this collection embraces, in addition to lyrics composed by David, others of an earlier date, and many of later origin, ex-

[1] Judges v. 24. [2] "Speaker's Commentary," Judges v. 24.
[3] Ibid., Judges iv. 21.
[4] See Dr. Mozly's remarks, *Ruling Ideas, etc.*, p. 163 seq.

tending down beyond the Exile. And they bear the traces of the elder dispensation out of which they were produced. The Christian reader occasionally meets with imprecations that grate upon his ear, from their seeming antagonism to the humane precepts of the New Testament. This feeling is not confined to sentimental religionists who would subtract righteousness from religion. It is generally felt. Some have sought to construe these passages as a mere prophecy of what is actually to befall evil-doers; but this untenable interpretation simply shows the pressure of the difficulty which it seeks to avoid. Some would consider them an outburst of righteous indignation, free from all personal vindictiveness, like the cry of Milton in the Sonnet upon the Massacre of the Waldenses:

> "Avenge, O Lord, thy slaughtered saints whose bones
> Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold."

More commonly it is alleged that such imprecations were uttered by David in his character as theocratic king, as personating the Messiah, and with reference to the enemies of Christ. But if imprecations were uttered by David and other authors of the Psalms, from what may be called public considerations as distinguished from personal resentment, it still remains true that Jesus himself did not pour out maledictions against his foes, or against the enemies of his kingdom; for the denunciations uttered with reference to the Scribes and Pharisees (Matt. xxiii.), though expressive of indignation as well as grief, are not to be thus construed. On the contrary, He bade his disciples pray for those who hated them and their cause. They were rebuked for wishing to call down fire from heaven to consume his enemies. He himself prayed on the cross for the pardon of his destroyers. Among his precepts we feel ourselves in a new atmosphere, where the retributive sentiment is no longer uppermost.

But do all the maledictions in the Psalms admit of being referred to sympathy with divine justice, as contrasted with personal revenge? Is there not a residue which do not come under this category? Who can suppose the 109th Psalm to emanate wholly from this impersonal motive, or to have been written by a Christian disciple? "Let his prayer become sin," "let his days be few," "let there be none to extend mercy to him," "let his children be continually vagabonds and beg," "let his posterity be cut off"—compare these invocations with the Sermon on the Mount.

The truth is that the rule of retaliation—"an eye for an eye"—had been given to them of old time, but Christ gave another law, the law of love. Forbearance, and mercy to enemies are not unknown to the Old Testament; but they are in the background. They did not find that place in the Old Testament type of piety, which is given them in the teaching and example of Jesus. If Christ had nothing new to teach, why should he teach at all? To expect all the characteristic graces of the Gospel in the writers of the Psalms, and to complain if they are absent, is not less unreasonable than to wonder that flowers do not blossom in January. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."[1] The revelation of justice must precede that of forgiveness; and revenge, which Lord Bacon calls a kind of wild justice, bad as it is, is a less evil than torpidity of conscience. It was well that men should learn to abhor wickedness; the Gospel has taught us to discriminate between the evil principle and the person in whose character it mingles. The method of progress in the revelation of the Gospel is like that which is to govern its spread: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear."[2]

In the ancient Scriptures there is one book, analogous in

[1] John i. 17. [2] Mark iv. 28.

its structure to the Psalms, but of an ethical character,—the Book of Proverbs. It is an "anthology from the sayings of the sages of Israel, taking its name from the chiefest of them;" for it is a compilation which did not see the light in its present form until centuries after the time of Solomon. It is like the Psalms, which are "an anthology from the hymns, not of David only, but of the sons of Korah and others, some named, and some anonymous."[1] The Proverbs are distinguished from heathen literature of a similar kind by the characteristic elements of the Old Testament religion which are found in them. The Fear of the Lord is made the beginning of Wisdom. Yet in the prominence given to prudential motives, in the stress laid upon temporal rewards, the difference of tone from that of the Gospel is manifest. It is the point of view of the earlier dispensation.[2]

The difference between the Christian and the Jewish Dispensation is affirmed by Jesus in the reply which he made to the disciples when they were disposed to call down fire from heaven upon the inhospitable Samaritans, in imitation of the Prophet Elijah. "Wist ye not," he said,—for the answer should probably be read as a question—"Wist ye not what manner of spirit ye are of?"[3] The Spirit of God that animated them was a spirit of forbearance and love. The Spirit of God was with Elijah;[4] but

[1] "Speaker's Commentary," Introd. to Proverbs.

[2] When the historical and progressive character of Revelation is clearly apprehended, the value of such books, for example, as Ruth, Esther, and Canticles, is easily discerned. There is no book in the Old Testament which does not aid in illustrating the Dispensation. The moral standards, the social and religious sentiments, engendered at a given stage of Revelation, are reflected in the contemporaneous literature that springs up within its circle. All of this literature is stamped with a character which distinguishes it from the products of Gentile thought.

[3] Luke ix. 55.

[4] Compare Luke i. 17.

the retributive sentiment—the stern tone of justice—marked the elder Dispensation. It was a high, but not the highest, not the complete, expression of the principle of goodness.

The superiority of Christianity over the Judaic system, and the fact that it effected more than a bare purification of a corrupted doctrine and ritual, are involved in the reply of Jesus to the question of his disciples about fasting—why he did not make them to fast, as John made his disciples. "New wine," he said, "must be put into new bottles."[1] Institutions must conform to the doctrine which they embody. *They* must be new, because *that* is new. A new type of piety must create a new ritual congenial with itself. It will not brook customs incongruous with it. Closely connected as his religion was with the antecedent faith, it was yet no mere reproduction of the old. It was something original, differing from the former doctrine; though, in some sense, the complement of it. The New Testament authors call the hallowed rites of the Old Testament, shadows,—unsubstantial images of the realities of which the believer in Christ is possessed.[2] Indignant that Christian believers should retreat back to the Mosaic observances, the Apostle Paul styles them "weak and beggarly elements," or rudiments, which the Gospel has left behind.[3] The law which formed the kernel of the Mosaic Revelation is described in its moral as well as ceremonial features, as a schoolmaster, taking charge of the unripe youth, and leading him to a place where this provisional office is superseded.[4]

Apart from all other defects, the Apostle Paul sets forth the radical insufficiency of the Old Testament system. It was, in its predominant character, a law-system. Law, coming from without, had to encounter the principle of sin

[1] Luke v. 38, (Matt. ix. 17. Mark ii. 22.) [2] Col. ii. 17.
[3] Gal. iv. 9. [4] Gal. iii. 24, 25.

within the soul; and law had in it no power of moral regeneration. The proper result of the Old Testament system, as the Apostle Paul explains it, was to make this fact manifest in the consciousness of men, and to awaken a yearning for deliverance from sin, through a power working from within. The triumph of the Old Testament form of the kingdom was in the demonstration of its own failure; its failure, that is, to do more than to pave the way for something more effective. The ancient theocracy wrought its victory and attained its end when it moved "a Hebrew of the Hebrews" to turn from it in despair, with the cry, "Who shall deliver me?"

We proceed a step further in the discussion, when we say that Christianity is the perfect form of religion. In other words, it is the absolute religion. It is the final outcome of this long process of growth. It is not an inchoate, defective system, destined to vanish, like Judaism, by being merged in a higher form of creed and worship. The interest that is taken at present in the study of comparative religion, the more charitable spirit in which heathenism and heathen philosophy are judged, and a wide-spread skepticism in respect to the miraculous element in Christianity, predispose many to reduce the religion of the Gospel to the level of the Jewish or even of the ethnic systems. Such plainly is not the view which Christianity, as presented in the New Testament, takes of its own rank. Rather is it the culminating point in the progress of Revelation, fulfilling, or filling out to perfection, that which preceded. Several considerations will tend to establish this claim.

1. In Jesus Religion is actually realized in its perfection.

By such means alone could the kingdom of God on earth be consummated. This the Prophets, and especially Isaiah,

had discerned. "There must come some one who should perfectly satisfy all the demands of the true religion, so as to become the centre from which all its truth and force should operate." "Unless there first comes some one who shall transfigure this religion into its purest form, it will never be perfected, and its kingdom will never come. But he will and must come, for otherwise the religion which demands him would be false; he is the first true king of the community of the true God, and as nothing can be conceived of as supplanting him, he will reign forever in irresistible power." "Before the lightning flash of this truth in Isaiah's soul, every lower hope retreated."[1] This lofty, inspired ideal was fulfilled in Him who made it his meat and drink to do the will of God, and who drank the deepest cup of anguish with the words: "Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine, be done!"[2]

2. In Christ the Revelation of God to and through man reaches its climax. Revelation had been, from the beginning, the revelation of God. In the inspiration of the prophets, He became "at sundry times," for a season, a living Power in the soul, exalting and prompting its natural activities. These revelations, temporary and sporadic, foreshadow an abiding Presence of God in man, such as constitutes the peculiarity of the person of Christ.

3. In Christianity the fundamental relations of God to the world are completely disclosed. The old dispensation was a long crusade against heathenism. Heathenism partially, if not wholly, merged God in nature. The first verse of Genesis is a denial of an element of heathenism that clings to it even in its most refined forms. The Zoroastrian religion, the nearest approach to pure theism, divided the work of creation between two eternal Powers. Plato held to the eternity of matter, to say nothing of the realm of

[1] Ewald, *Geschichte*, iii. 710, 711. [2] Luke xxii. 42.

ideas. The Old Testament insists on the unity, the personality, and the transcendence of God. He is above the world, and distinct from it. This truth being secured, it remained for the New Testament to bring forward its counterpart, the immanence of God. He is in the world, though not, as the Pantheist dreams, to be identified with it. Thus the New Testament rounds out the revelation of God's essential relations to the world.

4. Through Christ, the kingdom of God actually attains its universal character.

The heathen religions belonged each to a particular nation. The divinities of every people were supposed to have appointed the rites of their worship within the territory which they protected. The religion of each country was interwoven with its civil constitution. It was part and parcel of a political system, and strongly reflected the peculiarities of the people in which it had arisen. Thus, instead of bringing men together in a common society, the heathen religions rather tended to keep them apart. Religion formed one of the barriers that separated nations from each other. Of necessity, Revealed Religion, at the outset, in its rudimental stage, was likewise national. It was confined within the limits of a civil community. Whoever would have the benefit of it must become, if he could, a member of that state. The privileges of the true religion were accessible only within the pale of a single people. Although they were ever assured that they were chosen, not because they were more deserving than others, but merely to be almoners of a blessing to mankind, yet their distinction might have, and did have, the effect even upon them to engender a proud isolation. Through Christianity, the external theocracy was dropped as a thing outgrown. Everything that was accidental, provisional, local, in religion, fell away. "Not in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem," was the

Father to be worshipped; His temple was to be in the human soul.[1] In the new kingdom, there was neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian, male nor female, bond nor free.[2] That is to say, in this high fellowship of religion, distinctions of race, of sex, and of condition—as between masters and slaves—vanish. A common sympathy sweeps away the walls of separation between man and man. The heavenly good of the gospel is of such a nature that it can be offered indiscriminately to all. The sense of a common relationship to Christ and to God melts away all differences. The brotherhood of the race is no more a philosopher's dream; it has become a realized fact. Appealing to a common religious sentiment, a common consciousness of sin and of the need of help, and offering a remedy that is equally adapted to all, Christianity shows itself possessed of the attributes of a universal religion.

Christianity vindicates its claim to this character, as being a religion of principles, not of rules. The Old Testament system was predominantly legal. The duties of men were enumerated, one by one; worship in its minute details was prescribed. Nothing in this department was left to choice. The law of human conduct was splintered into a multitude of particulars. A thoughtful mind always feels relief when it can descend below rules to their ground and source. In proportion as one penetrates to the ground-work of principles, he is enabled to dispense with rules. The soul becomes a law to itself; the end which the soul sets before it is itself a criterion of what is to be done and omitted. The rational perception and choice of an end of action bring freedom, emancipation. Conduct then flows from an interior impulse; it is a product of spontaneity. Christian life is not an "imitation" of Christ, in the ordinary conception of the term. It is a relation like that of the branches to the vine

[1] John iv. 21, 22. [2] Gal. iii. 28, Col. iii. 11

that infuses into them life. The work of the Gospel is described as a new creation in humanity; its disciples as new creatures in Christ; Christ as another Adam, a second head of the race.[1]

It is evident, that a code of rules, however adapted to the condition of a particular nation, in a certain state of civilization, may not answer when circumstances are altered. A legal system, therefore, cannot be permanent; it can never be an absolute religion in the sense we have given to the term. But the Gospel establishes a filial relation between man and God. It implants principles that can never become obsolete, because they coincide with rectitude itself, and can never need a supplement, since they involve in themselves all specific obligations. It is not conceivable that any more comprehensive principle should be brought forward to supersede love. No type of goodness can ever be discovered that excels the spirit of Christ. Because Christianity contents itself with the inculcation of seminal principles, not seeking to dictate or restrain conduct farther than these may prompt, it shows itself the ultimate form of religion.

It may be added that the institutions of the Christian religion—its polity and worship—are not cast into an inflexible shape. They flow out of its own creative spirit, and are, therefore, subject to variation. Even the simple features of the polity and cultus, which have an authoritative sanction, are in direct accord with the nature of Christian society. There are thus no unalterable forms of church government, and no unbending ritual, but room for that diversity which is required by differences in temperament, and by different grades of culture. Those who contend for a leaden uniformity in things external, misconceive the genius of the Christian religion. They lose sight of the catholic quality that belongs to it.

[1] 2 Cor. v. 17, 1 Cor. xv. 45.

The progress of religion within the circle of the Scriptures is not to be confounded with that kind of development through which Christianity has passed since it was first promulgated by the Apostles. That there has been a development since that epoch is no more than to say that Christianity is a living system. But there is this difference: in the giving of Revelation, at each successive stage, and especially at the consummation, there was an increment of its contents. New truths were added to the previous stock. This is not true of Christianity since the Apostolic age. Those who consider the Gospel a purely natural product, would efface this line of demarcation between Apostolic and post-Apostolic theology, and put both on the same level. Among the writers who have handled the subject with marked ability are certain Roman Catholic authors, as De Maistre, and Möhler, on the continent, and Newman in England. As Newman, in his most interesting and suggestive Essay, has shown, political and religious ideas are in their own nature fructifying. They do not, like mathematical truth, lie inert in the minds into which they fall. On the contrary, they produce a ferment. Christian truth affects in this living way the intellect, the emotions, and the will. The mind receives these ideas as into an alembic. It exercises upon them its analysis; it formulates them, connects them with the rest of its beliefs, elucidates and defends them by blending with them collateral truth which they imply. Theology, or the translation of Christian truth into dogma, is the result of this intellectual process. Christian ideas, likewise, and the objects of faith, excite the emotional nature. They call into life sentiments which incorporate themselves in Christian art and worship. In the proportion in which they transform the mind and character, they transform life. The ethical relations of Christianity are by degrees un-

folded. New obligations are brought to consciousness, from day to day. Cruel amusements of heathen antiquity died out under the silent influence of the Christian spirit. An atmosphere of feeling is produced, in which unrighteous legislation and brutal punishments cannot survive. Less than a century ago, Christian ministers imported slaves from Africa for domestic service. When the American Constitution was formed, Christian sentiment had not risen to a strength sufficient to forbid the continuance of the slave trade; and it was allowed for a term of years. Now this traffic is treated as piracy by the Christian nations. The New Testament did not, in express terms, prohibit slavery; but the spirit of Christianity abolished it. The treatment of the poor, of the insane, and of the suffering and afflicted classes generally, which failed to shock the Christian sense of a former day, is now felt to be inhuman. All these developments, whether of thought and belief, of worship and devotion, of Christian politics, or morals, as far as they are sound or wholesome, are due to the genius of Christianity. Here is at once their source, and the touchstone of their character. As Protestants, we must demur to the doctrine that an infallible safeguard exists against the introduction of elements at variance with Christian truth, which may prove the germ of a false development. But even the writers to whom we refer, hold that the whole deposit of revealed truth was with Christ and the apostles, and is contained in their teaching. So far as the development is normal, it springs out of the primitive seed. What we behold results from a clearer understanding, a more vivid appreciation, of the truth set forth in the New Testament. To the sum and substance of this truth, nothing has been added.

Christian ethics have sometimes been charged with fault. Mr. J. S. Mill, in his Essay on Liberty, says: "I believe

that other ethics than that which can be evolved from exclusively Christian sources, must exist side by side with Christian ethics to produce the moral regeneration of mankind."[1] He guards against misunderstanding, by adding: "I believe that the sayings of Christ are all that I can see any evidence of their having been intended to be; that they are irreconcilable with nothing which a comprehensive morality requires; that everything which is excellent in ethics may be brought within them, with no greater violence to their language than has been done by all who have attempted to deduce from them any practical system of conduct whatever."[2] If nothing more were meant than that the New Testament does not pretend to define all the particulars of duty, but leaves them in some cases to be inferred, Mr. Mill's observation would be just. He refers, in support of his criticism, to the absence of any recognition, in Christian ethics, of duty to the state, to the negative character of Christian precepts, to an exclusive emphasis laid upon the passive virtues, and to the want of reference to magnanimity, personal dignity, the sense of honor, and the like,—qualities which, he says, we learn to esteem from Greek and Roman sources.

The imputation that Christian precepts are pre-eminently negative, is surely not founded in truth. It is not "a fugitive and cloistered virtue" which is enjoined in the New Testament. To do good is made not less obligatory than to shun evil. The religion which has for its work to transform the world is not satisfied with a mere abstinence from wrong-doing.

It is not true that by insisting on mutual benevolence, Christianity thereby weakens the force of particular obligations. The Gospel does not frown upon patriotism any more than upon the domestic affections. Not the love of

[1] Page 93. [2] Page 94.

country, more than the love of kindred, is chilled by Christian teaching. The state, as well as the family, is recognized as a part of the divine order. It was an Apostle who loved his own nation so ardently that he was willing to be accursed for their sake.

If the passive virtues are exalted in the Christian system, it is not as the substitute, but as the complement of qualities of another class. Revenge is unlawful; truth is not to be propagated by violence; but unrighteousness in every form is assailed with an earnestness that admits of no increase. Nor does the religion of the New Testament discountenance the use of force for the protection of society. The magistrate is the minister of God for the execution of justice. As for magnanimity, the sense of honor, and kindred feelings, they are included in the category of whatsoever things are true, honest, pure, lovely, and of good report.[1] Christianity excludes nothing that is admirable from its ideal of character; and if there be virtues which have flourished on heathen ground, Christianity takes them up, while at the same time it infuses into them a new spirit—the leaven of an unselfish love.

Robust and aggressive elements enter into the Christian ideal of character; yet there was a reason why, at the outset, emphasis should be laid upon meekness, patience, resignation, and the other virtues called passive. The foes of a Christian were of his own household. All the forces of society, civil and ecclesiastical, were arrayed against him. There was the strongest possible need for the exercise of just these qualities. Particular affections, like the love of home and of country, have a root in Christian ethics. But since Christianity came into a world where patriotism, and other affections limited in their range, exercised a control that supplanted the broader principle of

[1] Phil. iv. 8.

philanthropy, it was requisite that the wider and more generic principle should be inculcated with all urgency, not with a view to extirpate or enervate, but to curb and purify subordinate principles of action. In Christian ethics, all the virtues, the milder and more negative, with the bolder and more heroic—courage in suffering, and courage in action, the self-sacrifice of the mother in her household, of the patriot on the battle-field, of the missionary to distant nations—find a just recognition.

We have now to inquire in what relation Christianity stands to the higher forms of heathen religion.

Independently of the doctrine set forth, there is an undeniable contrast between the tone of prophets and apostles, and that of heathen poets and sages in their loftiest moods. There is in the former a holy urgency, an authoritative directness, a pungency of rebuke, which strike the mind as a voice from within the veil. As in no other literature, the soul feels itself in contact with the supernatural. The human author speaks as one inspired, as the organ of the Eternal. "He taught them as one having authority" expresses the feeling of those who heard Jesus.[1] It indicates a character that belongs to the Bible, in distinction from all the products of heathen wisdom.

Yet underneath the superstition of heathenism the Apostle Paul recognized a true seeking for God. He quoted with approval a sentence from a heathen poet to the effect that there is something in man akin to the divine nature.[2] He declares that if a law had been given to the Jews, the same was true of the heathen. They, too, had a law written upon the heart,—a rule which was implied in their judgments of one another.[3] The contents of this unwritten mandate of conscience corresponded to the moral

[1] Matt. vii. 29; Mark i. 22. [2] Acts xvii. 28. [3] Rom. ii. 14, 15.

precepts of the Old Testament. There were not wanting teachers, of whom Socrates was the foremost, to inculcate moral obligations. There were influences fitted to educate the conscience. The sense of sin was far from being confined to the Hebrews. It finds a deep utterance in the literature of other nations.

Even the other element of the Jewish system, the element of prophecy, is not without its analogon among the heathen. There is a natural prophecy, the act of

> "the prophetic soul
> Of the wide world, dreaming on things to come."

There were yearnings that could not be met on the plane of natural religion, and under the order of things inseparable from heathenism. The sense of an unnatural estrangement from one another, and from God, sprang up in the hearts of men. There were walls of separation which had begun to chafe the spirit, but which it was impossible to surmount. There were ideas not to be realized under the divisive influence of Polytheism—"luminous anticipations"—glimpses, at least, of something better for man, yet beyond his reach. There was thus a kind of prophecy, as well as law, outside of Judaism.

If all this be true, and if the heathen nations, as well as the Jews, were subject to a providential training, why not assign the same propædeutic office to Gentile religion and philosophy that we assign to the Judaic system? Some have thought that we should do this; and among them, the eminent theologian, Schleiermacher. The arguments for this view do not lack plausibility. Heathenism, it is said, at least in its best representatives, was monotheistic. The Gentiles were equally objects of divine favor, and they were on the same footing, as regards the offer of salvation, as the Jews: "for there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek" (Rom. x. 12). Moreover, it is a significant fact

in connection with the first preaching of Christianity that the Gentiles were found, as a rule, more ready to receive it. The number of converts from the Jewish side was small in comparison with the multitude of heathen who welcomed the new faith. The Apostle Paul had been surprised—we might say, perplexed—by this unexpected and startling fact. This feeling in his mind was at the root of that whole discussion about election and the plan of God, in the Epistle to the Romans, which has been a battle-ground of theologians ever since. What could be the meaning of Providence? That the chosen people, the posterity of Abraham, should turn away from the blessing which the Gentiles were flocking to grasp! The immediate cause which the Apostle assigns, was the unbelief of the Jews. A moral blindness had overtaken them. But if the Old Testament people had become degenerate, and if the heathen were more open to the truth than they, where lay the pre-eminence of the Judaic system as a pædagogic instrument? Is not this a case where the tree is to be judged by its fruits?

But this question is not one to be settled by a count of heads. It remains true that "salvation is of the Jews." The fact of capital importance is that Judaism is the parent of Christianity. There was the hearth-stone of the new religion. The new system sprang up on the soil of the old, and could spring up nowhere else. There were "the oracles of God;" there were the Messianic promises, and the aspirations kindled by them, in a form that made it possible for the Messiah to arise, with a full consciousness of his calling, and to be recognized by others. The peculiarity lies in the organic relation of the parts of the earlier Revelation to each other, and the collective relation of the whole of them to the Gospel. Hence, the earliest adherents of the Christian faith by whom it was first propagated in the

world, its authoritative expounders for all time, were of Jewish extraction. Among the heathen, on the contrary, the foregleams of the Light to come were disconnected, scattered. There was no steady advance. Why was there no defined Messianic expectation among them? Why was not the Messiah born of the Gentiles? The Platonic Philosophy has educated many, from Augustine to Neander, for the kingdom of Christ; but out of Platonism the Gospel could not come. The kingdom of Plato is presented in "the Republic." Nor would men imbued with Platonism have formed the best nucleus of the early church. In the first centuries, the attempt to sever the new dispensation from the old, and to degrade or ignore the Old Testament, resulted in the wild speculations of Gnosticism. The fate of the new system, thus torn from its organic relations, was like that of a ship, cut loose from its moorings, and left to drift whither it might.

The privilege conferred on the Jews, in the special training to which they were subjected, might, if abused, place them at a disadvantage as to receiving the Good News, even in comparison with the nations which had been suffered "to walk in their own ways." "It might be," says Dr. Arnold, "that they were tempted by their very distinctness to despise other nations; still they did God's work,—still they preserved unhurt the seed of eternal life, and were the ministers of blessing to all other nations, even though themselves failed to enjoy it." It is a question how far the principle of Natural Selection will account for progress in the animal kingdom. It is certain that a principle of providential selection is often exemplified in history, in the dealings of God with mankind. Nations are sifted. A process of judgment and of rejection is witnessed. There is an apparent loss and waste; as when a few blossoms only, out of a multitude, fructify. The Apostle Paul affirms

this very principle of selection in the case of the Jews. There was an elect fraction who did not turn their backs on the Messiah—just as, in the days of Elijah, seven thousand were found who had not bowed the knee to Baal.[1] Moreover, it must be remembered that in some cases the docility which the heathen manifested when the Gospel was first preached, was due to an influence of the Old Testament religion upon them.

The Apostle Paul illustrates the character of ancient heathenism, by comparing the Gentile part of the church to the wild olive grafted into the native olive.[2] The wild olive is not worthless, but it can not bear savory fruit until it draws its sap from the stock that has grown up in the garden of the Lord. The branches of this stock, it is true, were broken off; yet to the engrafted branch, which partakes of its root and fatness, it is said: "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee."[3] In the same spirit, Schelling has called the heathen religions "wild-growing." They are like the flowers that spring up of themselves by the way-side, —not destitute of fragrance and beauty, yet inferior to the plants which have been watered and pruned by the hand of a skilful gardener.

In the inquiries before us it is important to bear in mind the distinctive character of Christianity. It is a religion. It is not merely, or chiefly, an ethical doctrine. Morality finds a broader statement, a more solemn sanction, and, above all, gains a new motive. But the morals of the Gospel is not the first or the main thing. Gibbon plumes himself on finding in Isocrates a precept which he pronounces the equivalent of the Golden Rule. He might have collected like sayings from a variety of heathen sources; although neither Confucius, nor any other of the authors in whom these sayings are found, contains the precept in a

[1] Rom. xi. 4. [2] Rom. xi. 24. [3] Rom. xi. 18.

form at once positive and universal. But an ethical maxim not very remote in its tenor from the Golden Rule, may undoubtedly be cited from a number of heathen teachers, and also from the Rabbis. Nowhere else indeed does this precept have the prominence that is given it in the New Testament. But the originality of the Gospel does not consist in particular precepts for the conduct of life, however noble they may be. The obligation to be pure, truthful, just, even the obligation to forbearance and compassion, was not unknown to the sages of antiquity. On these points of duty, Christianity, to be sure, speaks with an impressiveness never equalled before. But apart from the holy fervor of its moral injunctions, there is not so much that is absolutely new. Christianity in its essence is a religion.

Nor is it in any special truth, like the doctrine of immortality, that the substance of Christianity is to be found. Faith in immortality is not the exclusive possession of Christian believers. Philosophers argued for this doctrine, and some believed in it, with nothing to instruct them but the light of nature. They looked forward to a future state of rewards and punishments. The same thing might be said of various other propositions which are considered a part of religion.

Christianity has been properly styled the religion of redemption. Here lies its peculiarity. It is the approach of heaven to men; the love of God taking hold of men to lift them up to a higher fellowship. The originality of the Christian religion is to be sought in the character and person of Christ Himself, and in the new life that flows out from Him.

CHAPTER II.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE AS A PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY.

"THE coming of Jesus Christ is the providential justification of the conquering policy of the Senate."[1] The close relation of the Roman Empire to Christianity has not failed to strike thoughtful minds of whatever creed. A stern spirit, a hard, unrelenting policy, marked the steps of Roman conquest. To spare the submissive and war down the proud—*parcere subjectis et debellare superbos*[2]—was the recognized maxim; but in practice the Romans not seldom fell below the measure of humanity dictated by this rule. There were flagrant crimes against civilization, like the destruction of the great commercial cities of Carthage and Corinth, and the enslaving of their inhabitants. Yet in the course of events that built up the stupendous and long-enduring fabric of Roman dominion, even the Christian Fathers who reprobated those crimes, discerned a providential purpose.[3]

Circumstances favored the growth of Roman power. Had Alexander the Great lived to carry his arms westward, the issues of history might have been wholly altered. Had Greece not fallen politically and morally, and had the kingdoms of the East not sunk into decrepitude, the subjugation of these countries might have been impossible, and Rome might have been stopped in her career of conquest.

[1] Laurent, *Rome*, p. 8. [2] Virgil, *Æn.* VI. 483.
[3] Augustine, *de Civit. Dei*, v. 12, 15 seq.

But after Carthage, her great rival, had been crushed, there was no other people that had the energy requisite to withstand her progress to universal empire.

So extended was the sway of Rome, and so deep were its foundations, that it seemed incapable of overthrow, and came to be regarded as a part of the fixed order of things, on a level with the unalterable system of nature. Some of the early Fathers, therefore, looked forward to the subversion of the Roman dominion as the precursor of Antichrist, and the signal for the final catastrophe in the world's history.[1] The idea of the perpetuity of the Roman Empire entered deeply into the Christian thinking of the middle ages. That Empire was conceived of as the counterpart of the Church, securing that unity of mankind in the secular sphere, which corresponded, as a necessary condition, to their unity in things spiritual. An imperishable State was mated to an imperishable Church. Hence when Europe crystallized anew under the auspices of the Franks, it was the revived Roman Empire of which Charlemagne became the anointed head; and the same Empire was continued, in all its sacred authority, under the line of German Emperors.

While the agency of Rome in paving the way for Christianity has never been overlooked, the tendency has been to dwell too exclusively upon the external features of this preparatory work. The wide-spread peace consequent upon the subjection of so many nations to a common government, the facilities for travel and intercourse which were open to the first preachers of the Gospel, the shield thrown over them by Roman law, and other advantages of a kindred nature, have justly attracted notice. But there is another side to the influence of Rome that is even more impressive in connection with the subject before us. The ef-

[1] Tertullian, *Apol.*, 32; Lactantius, *Instt.*, vii. 19, 25.

fect of the consolidation of so large a part of mankind in one political body, in breaking up local and tribal narrowness, and in awakening what may be termed a cosmopolitan feeling, is in the highest degree interesting. The Roman dominion was the means of a mental and moral preparation for the Gospel; and this incidental effect is worthy of special note. The Kingdom of Christ proposed the unification of mankind through a spiritual bond. Whatever tended to melt down the prejudices of nation, and clan, and creed, and instil in the room of them more liberal sentiments, opened a path for the Gospel. Now we find that under the political system established by Rome, a variety of agencies co-operated to effect such a result. Powerful forces were at work whose effect was not limited to the creation of outward advantages for the dissemination of the religion of Christ, but tended to produce a more or less genial soil for its reception. We have then to embrace in one view the influence of the Roman Empire in both of these relations, in shaping outward circumstances, and in favoring a mental habit, which were propitious to the introduction of the new faith.

1. Glance at the extent and general character of the Empire established by the Romans. It stretched from the Atlantic to the Euphrates, a distance of more than three thousand miles, and from the Danube on the north, and the friths of Scotland, to the cataracts of the Nile and the African desert. All the tribes and nations inhabiting this immense territory had surrendered their independence, and were connected together in one political system. The Parthians in the far East were left unsubdued; and beyond the Rhine were the Germans whom the Romans failed to conquer, and could only repel to their native forests. There have been, and there are now, empires which cover more square miles; but the peculiarity in the case of Rome is

that she brought under her sceptre all the civilized nations of the world. And the relation of most of her provinces to the Mediterranean gave to her dominion a geographical unity. Of its entire population we have not the data for an exact estimate. It was somewhere from eighty to one hundred and twenty millions.

The Roman world—*orbis Romanus*, as the Romans proudly called it—naturally divided itself into two regions, the East and the West.[1] It was not a mere geographical line that separated them, but differences lying deep in history and in the characteristics of their inhabitants; so that subsequently, when the Empire was divided, it was not an accident that drew the line between these two grand sections.

The East comprised that portion of Western Asia which was included between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean on the west, the Caucasus on the north, the valley of the Nile on the south, and the Caspian, the Euphrates, and the deserts of Arabia on the east. Egypt was placed by the ancients in Asia, and formed a part of the Orient.

In the Isthmus between the Euxine and the Caspian, were the numerous tribes of the Caucasus, grouped in confederacies or kingdoms under the protectorate of the Romans. Mostly uncivilized, and in perpetual conflict with the Sarmatians, Scythians, and other Asiatic hordes which were already in motion, they formed the vanguard of the Empire. The Greek colonies along the coast of the Euxine served as a connecting link and a channel of commercial intercourse between the Caucasus and the East, and the civilized communities of the West. Armenia, harassed by the Arsacides, the Parthian rulers who held Babylonia and

1 See Amedee Thierry, *Tableau de l' Empire Romain*, p. 84 seq., with the references. In the brief paragraphs which immediately follow, I am principally guided by M. Thierry's sketch.

Chaldea, received its kings from the Romans, and was reduced to a province by Trajan. In Asia Minor there was a mixture of various races. Besides the indigenous peoples, the Greeks had their ancient and flourishing cities on the sea-coast. The Thracians had made their way to the coast of Bithynia. Celtic invaders had penetrated into Phrygia, and founded there the Galatian kingdom. A branch of the Syrian race had planted itself in Cappadocia. And, after the expedition of Alexander, all these different nations were mingled with occidental Greeks.

From the shores of the Halys eastward to the Tigris, and from the mountains of Caucasus on the north to the Arabian gulf, were spread the different branches of the Semitic race. On the north and extending to the Euphrates were the Syrians; in Palestine were the Hebrews, and upon the Tyrian coast the Phœnicians; in Babylon were the Chaldeans; while the nomadic Arab tribes roamed over the peninsula of Arabia and the plains of Mesopotamia. From the neighborhood of the Tigris, stretching toward the East, were the Persian dialects and nations. In the time of Augustus, the Roman boundary was the Euphrates. Arabia was still independent.

The native Egyptian race remained unmoved in its traditions, its social organization, and its religion; but in a few cities, of which Alexandria was the chief, under the auspices of the Ptolemies, Greek civilization attained to a flourishing development. Greece, which was considered to belong to the East, where it eventually fell at the division of the Empire, had nothing to boast of, save its glories in the past.

The primitive inhabitants of the African coast of the Mediterranean had belonged to one race, but had been divided into two aggregations or confederacies of tribes. West of the Lybian nations, along the whole coast as far as the

ocean, the Moors or Numidians had established themselves, whom tradition had traced to Western Asia as their prior home. Upon these barbarous peoples had come in the Greeks, who planted themselves about Cyrene, and the Carthaginians who made their abode in Carthage and its dependencies. Malta and Sardinia attached themselves to Carthaginian civilization, but Sicily was essentially Greek. The fierce and warlike Iberians, the primitive inhabitants of Spain, whose territory was fringed by Carthaginian and Greek settlements, after yielding to the Romans, not only learned military discipline from their conquerors, but developed a taste for letters. Over Gaul and Britain were spread the Celtic race, with its various branches, of which we have so full a description in the Commentaries of Cæsar. The Romans generally included under the term Illyricum the lands situated between Switzerland, Italy, and the Danube, and the confines of Greece and Macedonia; lands inhabited by a multitude of petty nations, only a portion of whom had adopted, in any considerable measure, the arts of civilization. Thrace felt the beneficial effect of its contiguity to Asia, and to the Greek cities, especially Byzantium.

The provinces into which the Roman world was divided were separated by Augustus (B. C. 27) into the proconsular, under the rule of the Senate, and the imperial, which were governed by the lieutenants of the Emperor. In these last were placed the standing armies. In the Senatorial provinces, the Emperor's authority, when he was present in person, superseded that of the proconsuls. In truth, the rule of the Senate within its own provinces was little more than nominal. Spain was divided into three provinces, of which the largest, Tarragona, in the north and east, and Lusitania, embracing the principal part of modern Portugal, were imperial, while Bætica, which corresponds pretty

nearly to the present Andalusia, with Seville and Granada, was under the Senate. Of the provinces into which Gaul was divided, Gallia Lugdunensis—so called from the flourishing colony of Lyons—and Belgica, lying beyond the Seine, with Aquitania, which extended from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rhone, were imperial, while Gallia Narbonensis, or Languedoc and Provence, was senatorial. Upper and Lower Germany, stretching from Basle to Leyden, on the west bank of the Rhine, were not constituted into provinces until later. They fell into the imperial class. Britain, also, was conquered, and became an imperial province in A. D. 43; comprising England, Wales, and the Lowlands of Scotland as far as the Friths. The other imperial provinces, under Augustus, were Rhœtia and Vindelicia, stretching from the top of the Alps to the Danube, and eastward to its junction with the Inn; Noricum, a battle-ground for the Roman legions and their German enemies; Pannonia, east of Noricum, embracing modern Hungary and portions of Austria; Mœsia, whose barbarous inhabitants occupied the territory which is now known as Servia and Bulgaria, and which, with Pannonia, included the whole right bank of the Danube, from Vienna to the Black Sea; and, in the East, Cilicia, Syria, Egypt. Dacia, on the north of the Danube, was not incorporated among the imperial provinces until its conquest in the time of Trajan (A. D. 107). Under the sway of the Senate, besides Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, of which, however, the last, together with Dalmatia on the east of the Adriatic, were subsequently allotted to the Emperor, were Gallia Narbonensis, or Languedoc and Provence, Bætica or South Spain, Dalmatia, Achaia, Macedonia, Cyprus, Bithynia, and Pontus, or the land south-west of the Black Sea, Asia—that is, the portion of Asia Minor to the west of Mt. Taurus and the River Halys, Crete, with Cyrenaica, or the northern coast of

Africa, which is now divided between Egypt and Tripoli; Africa—that is, the main part of the ancient Carthaginian territory as far as the boundary of Mauretania between Cirta and Sitifis, now Constantine and Setif, in Algiers. Eastern and Southern Spain, the oldest of these provinces, with the exception of Sicily, had been conquered about the middle of the sixth century after the foundation of the city; the youngest, Egypt, Mœsia, Pannonia, were annexed to the Empire as the fruit of the victory over Mark Antony; Pannonia not being constituted a province until A. D. 10. Italy, of which Augustus fixed the Northern boundary at the Var, was governed, not by a proconsul, but by the civil officers of its own colonies and municipalities; and was divided for administrative purposes into eleven regions or circles.[1] There were districts under direct imperial control, which had not a regular provincial organization, but might be governed, like the Alpine districts, and Judea, by Procurators, or, in the case of Egypt, by a Prefect.

Rome did not make the first experiment towards the unification of mankind in a political form,—the only form in which the ancients could conceive of such a union. There had arisen a series of great Empires, extending back to the dawn of authentic history. First, Egypt, then the earlier kingdom of Babylon, then the Assyrian Empire, then the later Babylonian kingdom, had each of them collected multitudes of men under the sway of a single master. These colossal despotisms, notwithstanding the oppression and cruelty that belonged to them, were necessary to the rise of civilization. They put an end to the isolation of

[1] On the division of the Empire into provinces, see Marquardt in the *Handb. d. röm Alterthümer*, Vol. iv. (1873); especially the table, p. 330 seq. See, also, Von Reumont, *Gesch. d. Stadt Rom.* i. 217, and Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, i. 122.

warring tribes. They brought men together in peaceful intercourse, within walled towns. There, since the arts of defence always kept in advance of the means of attack, the fruits of industry could be stored up, and the conditions of society were fitted in some degree to stimulate invention and discovery. Yet under these old conquering powers, men were welded together in a mass; the individual counted for nothing. With the rise of the Persian monarchy, dominion was transferred from the Semitic to the Aryan family. The Persians in many things anticipated the Romans. Great roads, for example, bound together the different parts of their Empire. Herodotus describes the grand highway stretching from Susa, the capital, to Sardes near the western coast of Asia Minor; along whose whole length of 1,500 miles, were placed, at short intervals, government stations, and fine caravansaries for travellers, and which was traversed by the couriers of the Great King, riding by post, in five or six days.[1]

But the nations subject to the Persian dominion were not assimilated. It was a conglomerate of tributary peoples, with no approach to an organic union among them. The Greeks attached a moral value to the individual; through them a government of laws superseded the will of a despot, philosophy arose, and liberty and culture were appreciated. Yet the Greeks, notwithstanding their political talent, were driven by circumstances to organize themselves in small communities. Their states were municipal. Their confederacies were loosely bound together, and easily dissolved. The allies of Athens were so harshly treated that they deserted her in the time of her deepest distress, and left her to be crushed by her enemies; while the wisdom of Roman policy was manifest in the continued fidelity of the Latin allies in the great crisis of the struggle with

[1] Hist. v. 52 seq.

Hannibal. The empire of the Macedonian conqueror fell to pieces at his death. It perished with its founder. He spread the Greek language in the East, and with it a tinge of Hellenic culture; but he founded no united dominion co-extensive with his conquests. Rome, on the contrary, which properly succeeded to the work of Alexander, moved forward with a slower but sure advance, and held whatever she won, not solely or chiefly by the iron grasp of military power, but rather by a sagacious policy which, without sweeping away local customs and laws, aimed to dissolve former political bonds, and to establish stronger ligaments of connection with herself. Through her colonial system she established bodies of trustworthy supporters in the very heart of the communities that she annexed.

Rome did not begin, like the Greek cities, in the subjugation of one race by a stronger which trampled under foot the subject population. In the Palatine settlement there was a combination of different tribes and races on a footing of equality, and it furnished an open asylum to fugitives of all sorts. A distinction of classes, and an aristocracy arose, and the exclusiveness of the Patrician order increased after the expulsion of the kings. But within the walls of the city, the Plebeians gained, step by step, the concessions which at last broke down all the barriers of privilege. In the treatment of allies without, there was an analogous growth of liberality. The inhabitants of certain towns—municipia—were granted the rights of Roman citizenship. Citizenship became not a local but a personal distinction. It embraced certain private rights, and certain political rights; these last being principally the right of suffrage, and eligibleness to office. One possessed of the full prerogatives of a citizen, wherever his abode might be, could present himself at Rome and take part in the elections.

He belonged to a great fraternity—the civitas—actuated by common ideas, and taking pride in the possession of peculiar immunities and powers. The privileges involved in citizenship might be conferred on foreigners, in whole or in part. Not unfrequently upon Latin towns the private rights —for example, the right of commerce or of marriage with Romans—were bestowed, without the grant of political rights. Thus there grew up in connection with the Roman hegemony in Latium, a legal system—the *jus Latii*—which defined the rights and privileges of these more favored cities; and a similar system—the *jus Italicum* —with reference to the Italic communities, which were favored, though in a less degree than the Latin towns.[1] The struggle for equality on the part of the Latins and Italians resulted, in the end, in the communication of the rights of citizenship to all these allies. This advantage was gained by the Latins B. C. 90, by the Lex Julia, as the fruit of the Social War, and was soon after extended to the Italians. The territories outside of Italy, which were subject to Rome, were either provinces, free or confederated cities, or allied kingdoms. The *jus Italicum*, and sometimes the *jus Latii*, was conferred upon cities, here and there, beyond the bounds of Italy. The tendency of historical changes was to diffuse abroad the privileges connected with citizenship. This tendency was strengthened by the conversion of the Republic into the Empire. Cæsar had sedulously befriended the provinces, and in the civil war found in them his strongest support. By his victory, the democratic party of which Caius Gracchus may be considered the principal founder, and which Marius had afterwards led, gained the ascendency, and the ruling oligarchy fell from power. It has been questioned whether Cæsar

[1] Upon the *Jus Latii* and the *Jus Italicum*, see Walter, *Gesch. d. röm. Rechts*, pp. 194, 196.

had distinctly in view the political elevation of the provinces, or anything beyond their rescue from misgovernment. It is certain, however, that the party by which he was raised to power, had generally stood as the opponent of Roman exclusiveness, and that his own measures tended strongly in the same direction. The government of the world by a single city could not be perpetual. There was a constant reaction of the provinces upon Rome. A vast influx of foreigners had filled the capital with a mixed, heterogeneous populace. The spirit and policy of Cæsar were cosmopolitan. He scandalized conservative Romans by filling up the Senate with Gauls and other foreigners. He gave the suffrage to transpadane Gaul, and annexed that province to Italy. The same privilege he conferred on many communities and individuals in transalpine Gaul and in Spain. With the establishment of the Empire began a series of changes that led eventually to the granting of the rights of citizenship to all of its subjects. The tendency of the imperial system from the beginning was towards administrative uniformity, and towards the effacing of the distinction between subject and citizen. It is significant that the provinces were glad to see the rule of the Senate subverted, and the imperial government taking its place. Tacitus, speaking of the concentration of power in the hands of Augustus, says: "Neither were the provinces averse to that condition of affairs; since they mistrusted the government of the Senate and people, on account of the contentions among the great, and the avarice of the magistrates; while the protection of the laws was enfeebled and borne down by violence, intrigue, and bribery."[1] Even the worst Emperors, Nero not excepted, were sometimes not unpopular in the provinces, which felt their cruelty less than the Romans themselves, and rejoiced in their own escape from the

[1] Annal., i. 2.

tyranny and extortion of that class of Republican magistrates of whom Verres was one. The main point is that under the Emperors Rome became merely the capital, instead of the mistress, of the world. In proportion as the government was resolved into an absolute monarchy, Rome was reduced to the level of other municipalities. At length the chiefs of the State came to be taken from the provinces, and in the end from the barbarians themselves. The leveling influence of Roman absolutism, a tendency that inhered in it from the start, aided essentially in producing a sense of equality among men.

2. Deserving of special mention is the unifying influence of Roman jurisprudence.

The great system of law, the principal legacy of Rome to subsequent ages, was of gradual growth. In the middle of the 5th century B. C., the first written code, the Laws of the Twelve Tables, was composed. This continued to be an object of reverence and eulogy long after many of its provisions had become antiquated, and vast additions had been made to its meagre contents. The annual Edict of the Prætor was the principal provision for the modification and expansion of the legal system, to meet the altered state of society, and the demands of an advancing morality. When this magistrate assumed his office, he was required to set forth publicly the rules on which he proposed to proceed in administering justice; in particular the form and method of the remedies that would be open to litigants. The Edict constituted really a supplement to the established code, and a means of liberalizing as well as enlarging it. Beneficent legal fictions were introduced for the purpose of getting rid of the inconvenient formalism and unjust requirements of the ancient system. The *jus gentium* was not without its influence in effecting this amelioration. This was not a system of international law. The Romans had no

such system, and did not recognize the equality of States, on which this branch of modern law is founded. The nearest approach to international rules was furnished by the *jus feciale* which defined the customs to be used in declaring and beginning wars; but no inquisition into their justice was involved in its injunctions. The old *jus gentium* was not a rule for the intercourse of nations. It was simply the rules of proceeding in the case of sojourners not entitled to the privileges of Roman law; rules deduced by Roman officials from a comparison of their own system with that of the nations to which the class in question belonged. A common law was sought for, which could be applied to the determination of causes in which foreigners were parties. As early as 247 B. C., a special magistrate, the Prætor Peregrinus, was created to take cognizance of this class of causes. In the later days of the Republic, however, after the Stoic philosophy was naturalized at Rome, the lawyers who had imbibed its tenets, connected with the Roman Law the Stoic idea of a universal law of nature or reason, which underlies all particular codes, and is exalted above them in rank. The *jus gentium* came to be identified in this way with the *jus naturale*.[1] Cicero, in the "Commonwealth" and in the "Laws," frequently dilates upon the Natural Law, and upon the great community of gods and men, of which each single country is only a portion, or a constituent part. "This universe," he says in a passage of the last named treatise, "forms one immeasurable commonwealth and city, common alike to gods and mortals. And as in earthly States, certain particular laws, which we shall hereafter describe, govern the particular relationships of kindred tribes; so in the nature of things doth an universal law, far more magnificent and resplendent, regulate the affairs of that universal city where gods and men compose

[1] See Hadley, *Introd. to Roman Law*, p. 92.

one vast association."[1] Of law he writes in another place of the same work, that "it was neither excogitated by the genius of men, nor is it anything discovered in the progress of society; but a certain eternal principle which governs the entire universe, wisely commanding what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong."[2]

As we shall see hereafter, the doctrine of a Natural Law, the expression of general justice and reason, did not remain, in imperial times, a barren maxim. It affected to some extent the contents of the law. For example, it softened the legislation relative to slavery, and thus mitigated the relation of master and slave.

Through the Prætorian Edicts, there grew up, by the side of the old law, a more broad system of Equity. The Edict was termed perpetual, as not being subject to alteration during the term of office of the Prætor who issued it. Finally, under Hadrian, a Perpetual Edict was composed or compiled by Salvius Julianus, which was to be open to no further increase in the future.[3] Through the labors of jurisconsults from about 100 B. C., this great body of supplementary laws was reduced to a scientific form.

The Roman Law was for Roman citizens alone. For example, a sojourner at Rome, or a provincial in his own

[1] —ut jam universus hic mundus una civitas communis deorum atque hominum existimanda; et quod in civitatibus ratione quadam, de qua dicetur idoneo loco, agnationibus familiarum distinguuntur status, id in rerum natura tanto est magnificentius, tantoque præclarius, ut homines deorum agnatione et gente teneantur. De Legibus, L. i. 7.

[2] —legem neque hominum ingeniis excogitatum, nec scitum aliquod esse populorum, sed æternum quiddam, quod universum mundum regeret, imperandi prohibendique sapientia. Leges, L. ii. 4.

[3] This is Mr. Maine's view of the controverted question as to the nature of the work done by Julianus. See *Ancient Law*, pp. 61, 63, and Prof. Dwight's remarks, p. xxv. (Am. ed., 1877); also, Phillimore's *Roman Private Law*, p. 53. Compare, however, Wenck's note in Smith's Gibbon i. 268, and Merivale, *Hist. of the Romans*, vii. 426.

home, could not have the aid of the Roman magistrate in enforcing the father's authority — the *patria potestas* — which was so fundamental a feature of the Roman code. And the same was true of all the rights and immunities which were inseparable from citizenship. But wherever there was a citizen, this law was operative. Hence in the colonies everywhere, justice was administered according to its provisions. This, however, was far from being the limit of its operation. The governors of provinces issued edicts analogous to those issued by the prætors. In these, they proclaimed the rules and methods by which they would abide in the administration of justice. While the local laws and customs were left in force, especially in minor causes, the Roman law was not without a decided and increasing influence upon the programme of the prefect, and upon the whole judicial administration of the provinces.[1] This was more likely to be the case as the Edict would often be prepared at Rome, and under the advice of lawyers. As the bounds of citizenship were extended, the sphere of the Roman law was, of course, correspondingly widened. In the period when Christianity was spreading in the Roman world, the minds of men were becoming more and more familiar with this legal system. It was one of the means of reducing to homogeneity the component parts of the Empire. The conceptions that entered into the warp and woof of this great code were insinuating themselves into the common thinking of mankind.

3. We have to refer to the assimilation of mankind in language and culture.

The monarchy that was formed under the auspices of Julius Cæsar was Romano-Hellenic in its essential character. It was not a sudden creation; the materials of it had been long in preparation. The two nations which the policy of

[1] See Walter, *Gesch. d. röm. Rechts*, p. 436.

this great statesman aimed to unite as the main component elements of the Empire, had long been acting powerfully upon one another, as well as upon the so-called barbarian peoples. The process of Romanizing and Hellenizing the nations—if these terms may be allowed—had begun centuries before. The Greeks, like the Phœnicians before them, were a maritime and colonizing people. Their cities on the Western coast of Asia Minor were founded prior to 776 B. C., when the authentic history of Greece begins. The Greek towns in Sicily, and in the South of Italy, were some of them coeval with Rome. Cumæ preceded Rome by several centuries. Greek settlements were dispersed on the islands and along the sea-coast of the Mediterranean. Marseilles was founded by Phocæan colonists. From there Greek colonies planted themselves in Spain. The Greeks early came into close intercourse with Egypt; and through them was built up the flourishing city of Cyrene. The expedition of Alexander extended far and wide the Hellenic influence. The foundation of the city of Alexandria was an event of vast moment in this direction. There a multitude of Greeks were collected, who made the place a great centre, not only of trade and manufactures, but of Hellenic philosophy and culture. At Alexandria, the streams of Jewish and Oriental thought mingled with the current of Greek speculation. Its population in the early days of the Empire was not less than one million. Recent excavations have uncovered the seven main streets, running in straight lines through the city, and the twelve other main streets that crossed them at right angles. Alexandria had an equal reputation for industry and thrift on the one hand, and for wit and learning on the other. The Museum, or Academy, and the Library, which were founded by the Ptolemies, were brilliant nurseries of scientific and literary study. Antioch, founded by Seleucus Nicator, rivalled the Egyptian

capital in grandeur, and in the number and diverse nationality of its inhabitants. Its main street extended in a straight line for four miles, and like the main street of Alexandria, was bordered on both sides by colonnades. The rivals and successors of the Tyrians and Carthaginians, the Greeks transplanted their language to every port to which their ships sailed. But the Greeks were the lettered people of antiquity. Wherever a love of knowledge and of art was awakened, there Greek books penetrated, and Greek teachers and artists were welcomed. The downfall of Greek liberty, and the political and social calamities that followed, contributed efficiently to diffuse their language and learning. The phenomena, though on a vaster scale, may remind us of what occurred before and after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, in the fifteenth century. A multitude of Greek slaves, especially after the fall of Corinth, were brought into Italy. Roman households were filled with them. The conservative Roman spirit had at first resisted the introduction of Greek learning. Cicero refers to the prejudice of his grandfather against the study of the Greek language. Cato was for driving the embassy of Greek philosophers out of Rome. He opined the worst results from the introduction of their doctrines. There was a contest like that between the old learning and the new, which prevailed at the Renaissance. But it was vain to attempt to stem the tide of innovation. The Roman youth, if at all studious, could not be withheld from acquiring the tongue of Plato and Sophocles, from placing themselves under the tuition of Greek rhetoricians and philosophers, and even, as in the case of Cicero, from resorting to Athens for instruction. Greek was the language of commerce, and the vehicle of polite intercourse, far more even than was true of French, in Europe, in the age of Louis XIV. "Greek," says Cicero, in his Oration for Archias, "is read

in almost all nations; Latin is confined by its own boundaries, which, of a truth, are narrow."[1] "Wherever the Roman legionary went, the Greek schoolmaster, no less a conqueror in his own way, followed; at an early date we find famous teachers of the Greek language settled on the Guadalquivir, and Greek was as well taught as Latin in the institute at Osca."[2] To a vast number of Jews dwelling out of Palestine, Greek was the vernacular tongue. Two centuries and a half before Christ, the Septuagint version of the Old Testament had been made at Alexandria; and this was the Bible with which they were chiefly familiar. But the inhabitants of Palestine itself, like so many other peoples at that time, were bilingual. Their narrow strip of territory was bordered on the east and west by Greek-speaking towns. The disciples of Christ were doubtless acquainted with Greek from their childhood. When the Apostle Paul was rescued from the mob at Jerusalem by a detachment of the Roman garrison, he craved the privilege of addressing the people. When they found that he spoke to them in Hebrew—that is, Aramaic—"they were the more attentive."[3] It is implied that they would have understood him had he spoken in Greek, as they seemed to expect that he would; but their own dialect was more grateful, as well as more familiar, to their ear. An illustration of this bilingual characteristic so common at that time, is presented in Luke's account of the preaching of Paul and Barnabas at Lystra, a town of Lycaonia in Asia Minor.[4] A miracle wrought by Paul had such an effect upon the people, that they took him and his companion for gods who had come down in the form of men, identifying Barnabas with Jupiter, and Paul, as the principal speaker,

[1] Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur.—Pro Arch., 10.

[2] Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome*, iv. 641. [3] Acts xxii. 2. [4] Acts xiv. 8-19.

with Mercury. In their excitement, they called out in their own dialect—" in the speech of Lycaonia "—that the gods were with them, and forthwith made ready to pay them divine honors. Paul and his associate had not at first perceived what they would do,—not understanding their language; but as soon as the Apostles found out what was intended, they repelled the design with warmth. The discourse of the Apostles had been in Greek, which was perfectly intelligible to their auditors; but these, when moved with strong emotion, fell back upon their vernacular, which Paul and Barnabas did not comprehend. Had the Lycaonians not been familiar with Greek, the messengers of the Gospel could not have preached to them. But for the diffusion of the Greek language generally, they would have been stopped everywhere by a like insuperable barrier. Under this check, the new religion, exposed as it was to hostility on the right hand and left, might not have lived long enough to take root. Persecuted in one city, its preachers could flee to another; and they were possessed, wherever they went, of a ready vehicle of communication with the people. Greek may be said to be the language of the primitive Church, at least beyond the bounds of Palestine. The earliest Christian worship at Rome was in that tongue. It was the medium for the expression of Christian thought, the language of theology in the first age of Christianity, in the West as well as East. Of the wide-spread influence of the Greek language and culture, Döllinger writes: "The sway of Greek customs, of the Hellenic tongue, maintained and extended itself continually, from the Euphrates to the Adriatic. Like a mighty stream, rushing forward in every direction, Hellenism had there overspread all things. Even in remote Bactria, as far as the banks of the Indus, Greek was understood. Greek culture held its

ground as late as the first centuries after Christ. Parthian kings had the dramas of Euripides enacted before them. Greek rhetoric and philosophy, the Hellenic predilection for public speeches, discussions, and lectures, prevailed through the Asiatic cities." [1]

In the Roman dominions west of the Adriatic, the Latin had a corresponding prevalence. Gaul, conquered by Julius Cæsar, rapidly experienced the influence of the language and civilization of Rome. The same effect followed in Spain, and, in a greater or less degree, in all the other provinces of the West. Speaking of the age of the Antonines, Gibbon says: "The language of Virgil and Cicero, though with some inevitable mixture of corruption, was so universally adopted in Africa, Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Pannonia, that the faint traces of the Punic or Celtic idioms were present only in the mountains or among the peasants." [2] As regards Britain only, the statement needs to be essentially curtailed; respecting the other countries named, it is well sustained by proof. Nor was the influence of the Latin restricted to the Occident. Roman magistrates, wherever they were, promulgated their laws and decrees in their own tongue. It was the language of courts and of the camp. In the year 88 B. C., by the order of Mithridates, all the Romans in the cities of Asia were massacred in a single day. The number was at least forty thousand; it is made twice as large by two of the ancient writers, and Plutarch's statement is one hundred and fifty thousand. The Romans who, at all times, were found in so great numbers in the countries of the East, on errands of business, war, or pleasure, made the Latin familiar to numerous natives of those regions.

4. We have to notice briefly the means and motives of intercourse between the inhabitants of the Empire. Fried-

[1] Heidenthum u. Judenthum, p. 33. [2] Vol. i., p. 174, (Smith's ed.)

länder, in his learned discussion of this topic,[1] has pointed out that at no time down to the beginning of the present century, has it been possible to make journeys with so much ease, safety, and rapidity, as in the first centuries of the imperial era. The motives and occasions of travel were quite as various then as now. The Empire brought peace to the world. It was a new condition of mankind. The constant employment of nations had been war. The ancient writers dwell with rapture upon the reign of tranquillity which now prevailed. The security of the traveller and the facility of intercourse are a common theme of congratulation in writers from one end of the Empire to the other. The majesty of Rome, as Pliny proudly declares, was the shield of the wayfarer in every place. Epictetus, and the Alexandrian Philo are especially fervid in their remarks on this subject.[2] They dilate on the busy appearance of the ports and marts. "Cæsar," writes the Stoic philosopher, "has procured us a profound peace; there are neither wars, nor battles, nor great robberies, nor piracies; but we may travel at all hours, and sail from east to west."[3] The vast territory subject to Rome was covered with a net-work of magnificent roads, which moved in straight lines, crossing mountains and bridging rivers, binding together the most remote cities, and connecting them all with the capital. The deep ruts, worn in the hard basaltic pavement, and still visible even in places far from the metropolis, show to what extent they were used. Five main lines went out from Rome to the extremities of the Empire. These, with their branches running in whatever direction public convenience required, were connected at the sea-ports with the routes of maritime travel. A journey might have been made upon

[1] Sittengeschichte Roms., ii. 1 seq. (3d ed.)
[2] See the references in Friedländer, ii. 4.
[3] Diss., iii. 13. 9.

Roman highways, interrupted only by brief trips upon the sea, from Alexandria to Carthage, thence through Spain and France, and northward to the Scottish border; then back through Leyden, Cologne, Milan, eastward by land to Constantinople and Antioch, and thence to Alexandria; and the distance traversed would have exceeded 7,000 miles. The traveller could measure his progress by the mile-stones along all these roads; and maps of the route, giving distances from place to place, with stopping-places for the night, facilitated his journey. Augustus established a system of postal conveyances, which were used by officers, couriers, and other agents of the government; but private enterprise provided similar means of travel for the public generally. In the principal streets of large cities carriages could be hired, and one could arrange for making a journey, in Italy at least, by a method resembling the modern post, or vetturino.

The fact that so extensive territories were united under one government gave rise to a great deal of journeying from one part to another. Magistrates, and official persons of every sort, were travelling to and from their posts. There were frequent embassies from the provinces to Rome. Large bodies of troops were transferred from place to place, and thus became acquainted with regions remote from their homes. A stream of travel flowed from all directions to the capital; but there was also a lively intercourse between the several provinces. "Greek scholars," says Friedländer, "kept school in Spain; the women of a Roman colony in Switzerland employed a goldsmith from Asia Minor; in the cities of Gaul were Greek painters and sculptors; Gauls and Germans served as body-guards of a Jewish king at Jerusalem; Jews were settled in all the provinces." The Empire gave a new impetus to commerce. There was everywhere one system of law, free-trade with the capital,

and uniformity in coins, measures, and weights. In the reign of Claudius, an embassy came to Rome from a prince of the island of Ceylon, who had been struck with admiration for the Romans by finding that the denarii, though stamped with the images of different Emperors, were of just the same weight. In ancient times, mercantile transactions could not, as now, be carried forward by correspondence. Hence, merchants were commonly travellers, visiting foreign markets, and negotiating with foreign producers and dealers, in person. Horace frequently refers to the unsettled, rambling life characteristic of merchants. Pliny describes them as found in a throng upon every accessible sea. In an epitaph of a Phrygian merchant, accidentally preserved, he is made to boast of having sailed to Italy, round Cape Malea, seventy-two times.

The pirates, who, before the time of Pompey and Cæsar, had rendered navigation so perilous, had been swept from the Mediterranean. The annexation of Egypt enabled Augustus to establish a new route of commerce with the East, by the way of the Nile and the Arabian gulf. Roman merchants visited every land. They had their ports for trade in Britain, and on the coast of Ireland. They brought amber, in the first century, from the shores of the Baltic. They went with their caravans and vessels to Ethiopia and India. The increase of luxury in the capital stimulated trade. Whatever could gratify the palate was brought from all quarters to the markets of Rome; and the same was true of the multiform products of art and mechanical skill.

In the Book of Revelation, where Rome is designated as Babylon, her imports are thus enumerated: "The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all man-

ner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odors, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men" (Rev. xviii. 12–14). Except in winter, when the ancients laid up their ships, the sea was alive with vessels, transporting to Rome the precious metals from the mines of Spain, wild animals for the arena from Africa, the wines of Greece, the woollens of Asia Minor, the gums, and silks, and diamonds, of the East. The great corn fleet from Egypt was met at Puteoli by a deputation of Senators, and greeted with public demonstrations of joy.

Journeys from scientific curiosity were not at all unfrequent. Men visited distant countries in quest of knowledge. Each province had seats of education to which young men resorted. To Rome, Alexandria, and Athens, students came from all parts of the world. In Rome, and Athens, chairs of instruction were established by the State, and thus, like Constantinople afterwards, they had what resembled modern universities. Rhetorical teachers were accustomed to journey from city to city. To the more successful of them statues were erected by their admiring pupils, or by the municipal authorities, in the various places where they had sojourned. Artists, and manufacturers of artistic works of every kind, led a wandering life. They plied their vocation for a time in one city, and then transplanted themselves to another. They might be summoned from remote communities for some task of peculiar magnitude, or requiring extraordinary skill. If this class of persons were migratory in their habit, much more was this true in the case of actors, musicians, athletes, and purveyors of amusement of every description. When we consider how universal was the taste for art and artistic decoration, and how insatiable the craving for popular entertainments, we can judge how

numerous were the itinerants whose business it was to minister to these demands. Great public festivals, like the Pythian games, drew together a countless throng of spectators. Religious ceremonies, like those of the Eleusinian mysteries, had a like attractive power. Religious pilgrimages are not a peculiar feature of Christian society. Such visits were not uncommon to the shrines of heathenism. Invalids, in those days as at present, either of their own motion, or by the advice of physicians, undertook journeys by land and upon the sea, for the restoration of health. Then tourists who visited different countries, from a curiosity to see strange lands, and to inspect places of historical renown, were scarcely less numerous then than now. Egypt and its antiquities had a peculiar fascination for the Romans,—the same fascination that Rome and its monuments now have for us. Men journeyed from afar to behold the stupendous edifices upon the Nile. Grecian history, too, had a profound interest for the Romans. To them it belonged to a glorious past, and they resorted with reverence and delight to the spots made famous by Hellenic wisdom and valor.[1] In speaking of the means of social intercourse, we should not omit to mention the great watering-places,—places of fashionable resort, like Baiæ, where multitudes were collected at the proper season, and which were centres of gaiety, dissipation, and political intrigue.

In tracing the causes that produced a mingling of man-

[1] It is a curious fact that the relish for wild and romantic scenery, especially mountainous scenery, is of recent origin. It seldom appears in the literature of antiquity, or of the middle ages. It is not until the eighteenth century that this taste manifests itself to any considerable degree. The changed feeling, as contrasted with times previous, on this subject, may almost be said to date from Rousseau. Ruskin has called attention to the remarkable difference between modern and ancient feeling in this particular. The topic is fully treated by Friedländer, ii. 204 seq. (3d ed.). But as to Homer, see Shairp, *On Poetic Interpret. of Nature*, p. 143.

kind, we find that the terrible scourges, war and slavery, played a conspicuous part. The Roman Empire had been built up by incessant wars. In war, men of different races met, though it were for the purpose of mutual destruction. They crossed their own boundaries, and gained a better knowledge of each other. Armies were captured and surrendered, towns occupied by a conquering force. In like manner, slavery as it existed in the ancient world, leading as it often did, to the deportation of thousands of people at once from their homes to a new and, perhaps, distant abode, contributed to the same result. The hostility and cruelty of men were overruled by Providence, and made the occasion of a certain benefit.

We have stated that the Roman policy was to break up nationalities. In the case of the Jews all efforts in this direction proved futile. They maintained their separation of race, and held together in an unbroken unity.

There were three nations of antiquity, each of which was entrusted with a grand providential office in reference to Christianity. The Greeks, whatever they may have learned from Babylon, Egypt, and Tyre, excelled all other races in a self-expanding power of intellect—in "the power of lighting their own fire." They are the masters in science, literature, and art. Plato, speaking of his own countrymen, made "the love of knowledge" the special characteristic of "our part of the world," as the love of money was attributed with equal truth to the Phœnicians and Egyptians.[1] The robust character of the Romans, and their sense of right, qualified them to rule, and to originate and transmit their great system of law, and their methods of political organization. Virgil lets Anchises define the function of the Roman people, in his address to Æneas, a visitor to the abodes of the dead:—

[1] Republic, iv. 435 (Jowett, ii. 265.)

"Others, I know, more tenderly may beat the breathing brass,
And better from the marble block bring living looks to pass;
Others may better plead the cause, may compass heaven's face,
And mark it out, and tell the stars, their rising and their place:
But thou, O Roman, look to it the folks of earth to sway;
For this shall be thine handicraft, peace on the world to lay,
To spare the weak, to mar the proud by constant weight of war." [1]

Greece and Rome had each its own place to fill; but true religion—the spirit in which man should live—comes from the Hebrews.

The remarkable fact which we have to notice, respecting the Hebrews, is their dispersion over the world at the epoch of the birth of Christ.[2] Among those who listened to the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, at Jerusalem, were Jews "out of every nation under heaven"—Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea and in Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, Egypt, Cyrene, Crete, Arabia, and Rome.[3] Josephus says that there is no country on earth where Jews do not make up a part of the population.[4] In Strabo we find almost the same assertion. In Babylon and the neighboring region a multitude of them had remained after the close of the captivity; and, according to the Jewish historian, they were numbered there by tens of thousands. A colony of them had been planted at Alexandria by its founder; and there they became so numerous as to occupy two out of the five sections of the city, but were not con-

[1] Excudent alii sperantia mollius æra,
Credo equidem: vivos ducent de marmore vultus;
Orabunt causas meliùs; cœlique meatus
Describent radio, et surgentia sidera dicent:
Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento:
Hac tibi erunt artes; pacique imponere morem,
Parcere subjectis, et debellare superbos.—Æn. vi. 847–853.

[2] See Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, Art. *Zeitrechnung*.
[3] Acts ii. 5–12. [4] *Bell. Jud.*, vii. 33; *Ant.*, xiv. 7, 2.

fined to these quarters. They were governed by magistrates of their own; and while, in common with Jews every where, they kept up a connection with the sanctuary at Jerusalem, they not only reared synagogues, but had also a temple of their own at Leontopolis. In Egypt, in the first century of our era, there were not less than a million of Jews, constituting an eighth part of the population of the country. In the flourishing city of Cyrene they formed a large portion of the inhabitants. Nowhere, outside of Palestine, was the Jewish population more numerous than in Syria and Asia Minor. At Antioch they constituted a powerful body, and enjoyed there privileges analogous to those of their brethren at Alexandria. From Syria, they passed over into Asia Minor, forming settlements in all the principal towns. Besides the natural emigration from Syria, Antiochus the Great had transplanted to that region two thousand Jewish families from Mesopotamia. Among other places, Ephesus and Tarsus were noted seats of Jewish communities. In Crete, Cyprus, and other islands, there were synagogues crowded with worshippers. From Asia the Jews had found their way into the cities of Macedonia and Greece. Athens, Corinth, Thessalonica, Philippi, are among the places where were Jewish settlements. Jews were found in Illyricum, and early penetrated to the northern coasts of the Black Sea. The Jewish prisoners brought by Pompey to Rome, afterwards received their freedom. The district across the Tiber was principally occupied by them. An embassy of Herod to Augustus is said to have been accompanied by eight thousand Jewish residents of Rome. Among other towns of Italy, Caprea, and especially Puteoli, are known to have had a Jewish population. Apart from permanent residents of Hebrew extraction, Jewish merchants made their way to every place in the Roman Empire where there was any hope of profit from trade. Thus the Pales-

tinian community, though still the religious centre of all the Jews, comprised within its limits only a portion of this ubiquitous nation. Capable of making a home for himself anywhere, the Jew was specially adapted to the state "which was to be built on the ruins of a hundred living polities." "In the ancient world, also, Judaism was an effective leaven of cosmopolitanism and national decomposition; and to that extent specially entitled to membership in the Cæsarian State, the polity of which was really nothing but a citizenship of the world, and the nationality of which was really nothing but humanity."[1] Julius Cæsar, like Alexander before him, granted to the Jews special favors. Especially was this the case at Alexandria and Rome. Yet the Jews throughout the West were regarded with a peculiar antipathy. In Egypt, they were always objects of a national animosity. By the Roman writers, in particular after the stubborn and bloody insurrections in which the Jews endeavored to gain their freedom, they were spoken of with abhorrence. Their steadfast assertion that they alone were possessed of the true religion, excited both hatred and contempt from those who could see nothing in such a claim but the spirit of arrogance and intolerance. "Whatever," says Tacitus, "is held sacred by the Romans, with the Jews is profane; and what in other nations is unlawful and impure, with them is permitted."[2] Nevertheless, the Jews succeeded in making proselytes to their faith and worship to such an extent as to call out the sarcastic animadversion of Roman satirists, and to elicit from Seneca the complaint that "the conquered had given laws to the conquerors:" *Victi victoribus leges dederunt.*[3] Wherever they went, they carried a pure monotheism which neither bribes nor torture could move them to surrender, and which led them to spurn

[1] Mommsen, iv. 643.

[2] Hist. v. 4.

[3] Ap. Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, vi. 11.

with loathing all participation in the rites of heathenism. As the first preachers of Christianity went from city to city, it was in the synagogues that they first gained a hearing, and found a starting-point for their labors. There the law and the prophets were read on every Sabbath; and there would be found assemblies capable of apprehending, even if disinclined to believe, the proclamation of Jesus as the predicted Messiah.

5. What was the effect of the union and commingling of nations upon the heathen religions? The consideration of the general state of religion in the Roman Empire is reserved for subsequent pages. We advert here to a single circumstance,—the effect which must have resulted, and which, as history tells us, did result from the combination of so many nations under one sovereignty. There had existed a multiplicity of local religions. The gods of each people, it was believed, had ordained the method of their worship within the bounds of the territory over which they stood as guardians. National divinities were treated with respect by the Romans, and the diversified systems of worship were left untouched as long as they kept within their own limits. This was the extent of Roman toleration. For Roman citizens to bring in new divinities, or foreign rites of worship, was both repugnant to the laws, and abhorrent to conservative Roman feeling. Cicero, with all his liberality of sentiment, advocates, in his book of "the Laws," the suppression, among the Roman people themselves, of all departures from the legally established cultus.[1] Loyalty to the state involved a strict adherence to the state-religion. But polytheism could find room in its Pantheon for an indefinite number of deities. In early times, when the Romans attacked a foreign tribe, or city, they were at pains to invite in solemn form the local divinities to abandon

[1] De Legibus, B. ii.

the place where they were worshipped, and to transfer their abode to Rome. What must have been the effect upon the conquered nations of the inability or unwillingness of their ancestral gods to defend their own temples and worshippers? It is hardly possible that a shock should not have been given, in many instances, to the faith and devotion which experienced so terrible a disappointment. But our main inquiry here relates to the effect upon the minds of men of a familiar acquaintance with so great a variety of dissimilar religions. As regards a certain class, the tendency unquestionably was to engender skepticism. Lucian may stand as a representative of this class. In one of his diverting dialogues,[1] he represents Jupiter as pale and anxious on account of a debate which had sprung up on earth between Damis, an Epicurean Atheist, and Timocles, who maintained that there are gods and a providence. To avert a common danger all the divinities were summoned to a council. They came in a throng, those with names, and those without a name, from Egypt, and Syria, Persia, and Thrace, and every country under the sun. Mercury, to whom it belonged to seat them, could not quell their wrangles for precedence, and Jupiter ordered them to be seated promiscuously until a council could be convoked to determine their rank. While the debate goes on below between Damis and Timocles, the gods tremble with anxiety lest their champion should be worsted, and they should lose, as a consequence, their offerings and honors. Timocles appeals to the universal belief in the gods. "Thank you," rejoins Damis, "for putting me in mind of the laws and manners of nations, which sufficiently show how uncertain everything is which relates to their gods; it is nothing but error and confusion. Some worship one, and some another. The Scythians sacrifice to a

[1] Jupiter Tragœdus.

scimetar; the Thracians to Zamolxis, who came to them, a fugitive from Samos; the Phrygians to Mine [the moon]; the Cyllenians to Phales; the Assyrians to a Dove; the Persians to Fire; the Egyptians to Water." Then the special sorts of Egyptian worship, all differing from each other, are enumerated; and Damis concludes his lively speech with the exclamation: "How ridiculous, my good Timocles, is such variety!" It would be an error to conclude that the spirit of this passage, and of other passages in Lucian of like tenor, prevailed among his contemporaries. Yet it is obvious that he did not stand alone. All these religions must have seemed to many a confused jumble, and have moved some to reject all in common, if not to disbelieve in anything divine.

Another large class were tempted to forsake, in a degree at least, their traditional creed and worship, and to espouse another,—it might be some older religion from the East, which came clothed with the fascination of mystery.

A tendency to syncretism—to a mingling of heterogeneous religions—was a notable characteristic of the age contemporaneous with the introduction of Christianity. Men of a philosophical turn, in whom reverence for religion was still strong, sought to combine in a catholic system, and in harmonious unity, the apparently discordant creeds of heathenism. Plutarch is a conspicuous example of this tendency. The effort, futile as it proved, was one of the signs of the times, and was owing largely to the commingling of nations, and of the multiform religions which had divided the homage of mankind. An escape was sought from the distracting influence of polytheism, by an identification of divinities bearing different names, and by connecting a conception of the divine unity with the admission of multitudinous deities with subordinate functions.

Old beliefs were dissolving, at least were assuming new

forms, in the ferment of the Roman world. But the hope that there could be one religion for all mankind was deemed visionary. Celsus, the noted opponent of Christianity in the second century, thought that it might be a good thing "if all the inhabitants of Asia, Europe, and Lybia, Greeks and barbarians, all to the uttermost ends of the earth" were to come under one religious system; but, he says, "any one who thinks this possible knows nothing."[1] An expectation of this sort struck him as utterly chimerical. The Emperor Julian who dreamed of restoring paganism from its fall could not consider it natural or possible for the different nations to have a common religion. Their diversities were too radical. The Roman Empire did much to prepare the way for a universal religion; but such a religion it had no power to create from the materials of polytheism.

The idea of a common humanity, far as it was from attaining the force of a practical conviction, capable of neutralizing deeply-rooted prejudices of an opposite nature, was obscurely present in the minds even of men unused to philosophic speculation. The line of Terence,

"Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto,"—

"I am a man; nothing that affects man is indifferent to me" —signified, in the connection where it occurs, that the calamities which afflict one man should interest all.[2] "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." A Roman theatre, filled though it was with an ignorant rabble, when that line was heard, rang with applause.[3]

[1] Origenes *c. Celsum*, viii. 72.

[2] Heaut. Act i. Sc. i. 25. On the use made of this passage by Cicero, and other ancient and modern writers, see Parry, *P. Terentii Comœdiæ*, p. 174.

"I think, articulate, I laugh and weep,
And exercise all functions of a man.
How then should I and any man that lives
Be strangers to each other?"
—COWPER, *The Task*. (*The Garden.*)

[3] Augustine, *Ep.*, 52.

CHAPTER III.

THE POPULAR RELIGION OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS.

THE heathen religions did not spring out of a mere scientific curiosity which, in its rude beginning, can give no better account of the world than to attribute it to a multitude of personal agents. No explanation of the origin of heathenism is adequate, which fails to recognize the religious factor,—the sense of the supernatural, the feelings of dependence and accountableness, and that yearning for a higher communion which is native to the soul. These innate sentiments lie at the root of religion, even in its cruder forms. "I consider it impossible"—writes one of the most genial and profound of scholars—"that that all-comprehending and all-pervading belief in the divine essence, which we find in the earliest times among the Greeks, as well as other nations, can be deduced in a convincing manner from sensible impressions, and conclusions built thereon; and I am of opinion, that the historian must here rest satisfied with pre-supposing that the assumption of a hyper-physical living world and nature, which lay at the bottom of every phenomenon, was natural and necessary to the mind of man, richly endowed by nature."[1] This native faith was determined as to the particular forms it should assume, by the nature and circumstances of individual nations and tribes: hence the various modes of religion. Under the prompting of this latent belief, the

[1] K. O. Müller, *Proleg. zu einer wissenschaftl. Myth.*, Leitch's English Transl., p. 176.

personifying imagination, so rife in the childhood of mankind, endues all the separate parts of nature with personal life and agency.[1] The various beings thus created by fancy discharge the functions attributed by science afterwards to material and mental forces.[2] To them the phenomena of nature without, and to a considerable extent, of the mind within, as well as the course of events in the world, are relegated, each of them being in charge of his particular province. The classic religions had risen above that simpler stage, where the god is shut up to the special natural operation which it belongs to him in particular to fulfil. The deities of Greece and Rome are anthropomorphic beings, still performing, each in his place, the various offices in the movement of nature and of human affairs, which they had been—so to speak—called into being to execute; but they are no longer limited to these specialties. They constitute a society, and enjoy a wider range of activity. Poseidon (Neptune), in addition to the management of the seas, takes part, as a member of the Olympian Council, in the administration of the world's affairs. It is the middle stage of religion, where the divinity is not yet set free from the bonds of nature, distinguished from natural agencies, and elevated above them. This progress has begun, but is only partially accomplished.

But the minds of men demanded more in the object of worship than the imagination could impart. "The tendency to individualize, and the endeavor to comprehend the universality of Deity," blindly struggled with each other. Hence the conflict of higher and lower conceptions

[1] Upon the process of the development of myths, and the agency of language in connection with it, see Max Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop*, Vol. ii.

[2] Upon the impossibility of monotheism in the ancient worship of Greece, in connection with the prevalent notions of the external world, see K. O. Müller, p. 184.

—in the case of Zeus, for example—and that undercurrent in the direction of unity, which marks the history of the Greek religion.[1]

We shall have to notice three phases in the development of the Greek popular religion—the Homeric faith; that system as altered and ennobled in the age of the tragic poets, when Greek life was at its highest point of vigor; and the later era of decline and dissolution. We begin with the Homeric theology.

1. *The nature of the gods and their relation to the world.* The gods in Homer are human beings with greatly magnified powers. They are males and females, each class having the characteristics of the corresponding sex among men. Their dwelling is in the sky above us, and their abode on the top of Mt. Olympus.[2] They have bodies like those of men, but their veins, in the room of blood, are filled with a celestial ichor. In size they do not, generally speaking, surpass the human measure, but sometimes they are spoken of as gigantic. When Ares (Mars) (Il. xxi. 407) is struck down upon the field of Troy, he stretches over seven plethrums (nearly two acres) of ground. They experience hunger, but feast upon ambrosia and nectar. They are overcome with sleep. They acquire knowledge through the senses, which are of vastly augmented power. Hence they must be present where their power is to be exerted. This, however, does not hold true of influences upon the mind; but it is true of all external, visible doings, with the exception of a few instances in the case of Zeus. The cry of Ares and of Poseidon when they are wounded, is like that of nine or ten thousand men (Il. v. 860; x. 14,

[1] See Müller, p. 184, and compare Nägelsbach, *Hom. Theol.* p. 11, seq., with the criticism upon the views of B. Constant in his work, *De la Religion*, iii. 327 seq.

[2] On the distinction between the Iliad and Odyssey as to the abode of the gods, see Prof. Ihne, in Smith's *Dict. of Biog. and Myth.*, i. p. 510.

148). The eye, and ear, and the other corporeal organs have a like strength as compared with man. The deities travel with miraculous swiftness. Hera flies from Mount Ida to Olympus as swiftly as thought. But some physical instrumentality is frequently introduced, as when Athena puts on her beautiful sandals in preparation for her journeys. The divinities mingle in battle with men. They cohabit with human beings, and heroes are the offspring. Thetis was obliged to defer presenting the complaint of Achilles to Zeus, on account of his absence from home on a visit, of twelve days duration, among the Ethiopians. With regard to the mental and spiritual faculties of the gods, there is the same unsuccessful, inconsistent effort to liberate them from the limitations of humanity. Their boundless knowledge and power are asserted in terms, but their title to these high attributes is not at all sustained by what is narrated of them. Even Zeus is the victim of a trick of Hera, and is kept in ignorance of what is taking place before the Trojan walls. It was only after the event that Poseidon had knowledge of the blinding of Cyclops by Ulysses. As to their power, they are the creators neither of nature, nor of men. They can hasten or retard the processes of nature; they can heal diseases by a miracle; they can transform the physical shape of men. Ulysses is changed by Athena into an old and shrivelled beggar, and restored back again to himself. Moreover, they can give life to things inanimate; golden statues, "with firm gait," order the steps of Hephæstus.[1] They can give immortality to whomsoever they desire. The ease and blessedness of the dwellers upon Olympus are celebrated. Yet this bliss is far from being perfect. To Aphrodite, wounded and distressed, Dione says:

[1] Il. xviii. 417-421.

—— "Submit, my daughter, and endure,
Though inly grieved; for many of us who dwell
Upon the Olympian mount have suffered much
From mortals, and have brought great miseries
Upon each other."[1]

The goddess proceeds to tell of Ares, who was chained up for thirteen months in a cell, and who became withered and weak from long confinement; and of the anguish of Hera, and of Pluto, when they were pierced with arrows. If we look at the moral conduct of the Homeric divinities, we find it rather below than above that of the heroes who figure in their company. They resort to treachery and deceit to compass their ends. Zeus sends a false dream to Agamemnon, in order to effect a slaughter of the Greeks. Athena incites the Trojans to break their truce, to furnish an occasion for their own destruction; and she is sent on this malignant errand by Zeus, who, in turn, is instigated by the pleas of Hera. Athena, assuming the form and voice of Deiphobus, gives to Hector a deceitful promise of assistance, for the purpose of betraying him to death. Ulysses, lying in ambush by night, and finding himself cold, assumes that some god has misled him into leaving his cloak behind in the camp. It is needless to refer to examples of cruelty and sensuality on the part of the Homeric divinities. They are painted as the authors of evil, as well as of good. Hera and Athena never forgave the judgment of Paris in favor of Aphrodite, and pursued the Trojans with implacable wrath. The deities are capable of being appeased in individual instances; but as they act in this matter on no fixed principles, they may show themselves utterly implacable.

[1] Τέτλαθι, τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο, κηδομένη περ.
Πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
Ἐξ ἀνδρῶν χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες.
Il. v. 382–384 (Bryant, v. 472–476).

The prime distinction of the gods is their exemption from death. They are immortal. But for this they are dependent on bodily sustenance. There is a virtue in their food which avails to keep them alive. The very words "ambrosia and nectar" signify this. These, infused into the body of Patroclus, keep it from decay; "a rosy and ambrosial oil" saved the corpse of Hector from being torn, when it was dragged along the earth. The gods have a birth and beginning; but they are lifted above the lot of men by the one distinction of being immortal.

The gods are the guides and rulers of nations. Their interposition is potent, their protection and aid are indispensable. But they act in this capacity according to no wise and continuous plan. Caprice and personal favor play a principal part in their proceedings. The dependence of the individual upon the gods is entire. All physical and mental advantages are their gift. As Polydamas reminds Hector:

——"On one the god bestows
Prowess in war, upon another grace
In dance, upon another skill to touch
The harp and sing. In yet another, Jove
The Thunderer implants the prudent mind,
By which the many profit, and by which
Communities are saved." [1]

Ulysses reminds Laodamas that the gods make one man comely in person, but may deny to him the gift of genius and eloquence which they bestow upon another less beautiful. Two caskets of gifts, one full of good things, and

[1] ἄλλῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκε θεὸς πολεμήια ἔργα·
[ἄλλῳ δ' ὀρχηστύν, ἑτέρῳ κίθαριν καί ἀοιδήν·]
ἄλλῳ δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τίθει νόον ἐυρύοπα Ζεὺς
ἐσθλόν, τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἐπαυρίσκοντ' ἀνθρωποι·
καί τε πολέας ἐσάωσε, μάλιστα δέ κ' αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.
Il. xiii. 729–734 (Bryant xiii. 913–927).

the other of evil, stand by the threshold of Zeus: out of these the lot of men is made up. It is some god that makes Achilles brave. Athena inspires Diomede with valor. Zeus sends panic fear into the soul of Hector. Athena bereaves the Trojans of reason, that they may choose to fight in the open plain instead of behind their walls. The wisdom of the wise, the courage of the brave, felicity in domestic relations, safety and prosperity on the land and the sea, flow from the favor of the gods; and so infirmities and calamities of every sort are equally due to them. There is no devil in the Homeric system; no one being who plans and executes evil exclusively. The idea of such agents falls into a later period in the development of Greek religion. Hence, in Homer, evil suggestions and doings are credited to the gods generally. The functions of the Tempter and Adversary reside in them. They mislead, seduce, contrive mischief, prompt to crime. So far as evil purposes and proceedings are felt to be of preternatural origin, they are traced to Zeus and his associates. A deity is said to have prompted Helen to the foul wrong which led to the war of Troy (Od. iv. 339–343).

The general doctrine as to the administration of the world is expressed in the lines:

> —— "The great gods are never pleased
> With violent deeds; they honor equity
> And justice."[1]

But the exceptions to this rule on the pages of Homer are quite as numerous as the examples. The actual government of Olympus was marked by the same sort of injustice, oppression and partiality which were mingled in the conduct of human rulers towards their subjects.

[1] *οὐ μὲν σχέτλια ἔργα θεοὶ μάκαρες φιλέουσιν,*
ἀλλὰ δίκην τίουσι καὶ αἴσιμα ἔργ' ἀνθρώπων.
Od. xiv. 83. 84 (Bryant xiv. 100–102).

2. *The relation of the gods to each other.* Zeus sits as a King in the midst of his Council. They are not mere instruments of the Supreme Ruler. Posidon allows to his brother only a patriarchal supremacy, not an absolute, despotic rule. Like a family, the gods consult and debate on the summit of Olympus, where

> "The calm ether is without a cloud;
> And in the golden light that lies on all,
> Day after day the blessed gods rejoice." [1]

But this high assembly is far from being dignified or harmonious. Poor Hephæstus, limping across the floor, is greeted with inextinguishable laughter. The device by which he entraps Ares and unfaithful Aphrodite, provokes the same demonstration from the entire group of gods,—the goddesses, for decency's sake, having staid away from the brazen palace of the god of fire.[2] The converse of the deities is disturbed by harsh mutual crimination. There is little domestic concord between Zeus and Hera. Sometimes he takes pleasure in provoking her to anger. Then, like a timid husband, he advises Thetis not to be seen to leave his presence, lest Hera should raise new disputes and stir up his anger with contumelious language. The Iliad and Odyssey abound in passages in which the gods charge each other with crimes and follies,—generally with good reason. When the final struggle takes place between the Greeks and Trojans, the deities are sent down by Zeus to fight for whichever side each may choose to favor; and when he beholds them in the fierce contest with each other,

[1] ——μάλ' αἴθρη
πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη·
τῷ ἔνι τέρπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ἤματα πάντα.
Od. vi. 44–46 (Bryant vi. 58–60).

[2] But this passage is considered an interpolation in the Poem. There is nothing in the Poem which is like it, in the way of burlesque upon the gods.

from his quiet seat upon Olympus, he is said "to laugh in his secret heart."

Yet Zeus is supreme. None of the deities can vie with him in strength. None venture to contend with him, hand to hand. When he rouses himself, he enforces silence and submission. Hera and Athena may sulk, but they obey. When his anger is excited, he even flings about the gods without ceremony, and to their imminent peril. There existed in the Greek mind a natural craving for a unity in the divine administration. The superiority of Zeus gratified, in some degree, this feeling. When the Greek thinks of no other god, he thinks instinctively of Zeus. Still more is the tendency to monotheism disclosed in the relation of Zeus to his four children, Aphrodite, Hermes, Athena, and Apollo; especially to the two last. They stand as his deputies to execute his will and pleasure. The unifying tendency appears, also, in the conception of Fate —Moira—which in Homer hardly attains to the distinctness of personality. There were events which presented themselves to the Greek mind as the product of a blind, inevitable force. There were things which could not, without difficulty, be ascribed to the will of the gods; things which even Zeus deplored but could not help. Hence arose the notion of an all-determining Fate. In Homer, Fate is in some passages identified with the will of Zeus. Elsewhere there is a separation between the two. The idea hovers between a personification and a person.[1]

3. *Modes of Divine Revelation.* The gods made themselves known by personal intercourse with men. They visit the earth, confer with mortals, and exhibit their præternatural attributes. But this communication between heaven and earth belonged, according to the Homeric be-

[1] On the Homeric idea of Moira, see Welcker, *Griech. Götterlehre*, i. 186 sq.

lief, to an age prior to the Poet. The record is given of a state of things that had once existed, but had come to an end.[1] Even in the epic period, during the Trojan war, there were no further marriages of gods and men. The divinities present themselves invisibly, or visibly in their real form, or—what is most common—in the shape of man, and frequently of some particular hero whose form and voice they simulate. There were signs by which they made known their will,—such as thunder and lightning, the sudden passing of a great bird of prey. Where portents were of doubtful import, it belonged to the art of the seer, or soothsayer, to interpret them. Yet auguries were not always regarded with trust. When the eagle dropped from his talons the bleeding serpent into the Trojan army, Hector refused to be turned from his purpose, saying to Polydamas:

——"Thou dost ask
That I no longer reverence the decree
Of Jove, the Thunderer of the sky, who gave
His promise, and confirmed. Thou dost ask
That I be governed by the flight of birds,
Which I regard not, whether to the right
And towards the morning and the sun they fly
Or toward the left and evening. We should heed
The will of mighty Jupiter, who bears
Rule over gods and men. One augury
There is, the surest and the best—to fight
For our own land."[2]

[1] Nägelsbach, p. 132 seq.

[2] εἰ δ' ἐτεὸν δὴ τοῦτον ἀπὸ σπουδῆς ἀγορεύεις
ἐξ ἄρα δή τοι ἔπειτα θεοὶ φρένας ὄλεσαν αὐτοί,
ὅς κέλεαι Ζηνὸς μὲν ἐριγδούποιο λαθέσθαι
βουλέων, ἅστε μοι αὐτὸς ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσεν·
τύνη δ' οἰωνοῖσι τανυπτερύγεσσι κελεύεις
πείθεσθαι· τῶν οὔτι μετατρέπομ', οὐδ' ἀλεγίζω,
εἴτ' ἐπὶ δεξί' ἰωσι πρὸς Ἠῶ τ' Ἠέλιόν τε,
εἴτ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ τοίγε ποτί ζόφον ἠερόεντα.
ἡμεῖς δὲ μεγάλοιο Διὸς πειθώμεθα βουλῇ,

Dreams were another great channel of divine revelation; but these, likewise, might be of doubtful interpretation, or might be sent on purpose to misguide. More trustworthy than such outward vehicles of communication was the vision of the future, granted to individuals at favored moments, especially the open vision vouchsafed to the dying. Such a superhuman insight was the constant gift from the gods to select prophets, like Calchas, by whom not only the future, but the past and present also, were clearly beheld. Even these might not, in every case, command implicit confidence; so that the surest means of obtaining a knowledge of the gods, and of their will, was through their direct personal manifestation, in visible theophanies. The oracles, in Homer, are quite in the background.

4. *Piety and the expressions of it in worship and conduct.*—No doctrine and no law were communicated from the gods. There was no body of written teaching to serve as a standard of belief and conduct. The religious sentiment through all the earlier ages of Grecian history was profoundly active. A sense of dependence on the gods, and of the need of their help, existed in all except the few who are denounced as impious. Hector says to Achilles:

> "I know that I
> In might am not thy equal, but the event
> Rests in the laps of the great gods."[1]

Sacrifice and supplication, the two chief forms of devotion, attend every important undertaking and emergency of life. Thank-offerings follow upon good fortune. The

> ὃς πᾶσι θνητοῖσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνάσσει.
> εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος, ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης.
>
> Il. xii. 233–243 (Bryant, xii. 282–291).

[1] οἶδα δ', ὅτι σὺ μὲν ἐσθλός, ἐγὼ δὲ σέθεν πολὺ χείρων.
ἀλλ' ἦτοι μὲν ταῦτα θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται.

Il. xx. 434-435 (Bryant, xx. 545-547).

deities occasionally visit their temples and shrines, where these exist;[1] and with each of them a priest is connected. But there is no dominant hierarchy; the father is priest in his own household. Prayers are chiefly petitions, and not unfrequently assume the form of claims on the ground of some service rendered by the suppliant to the divinity. When Chryses beseeches Apollo to give him redress for the wrong done by Achilles, he rests his appeal on the fact that he had decked the temple of the god, and burned goats and bullocks upon his altar. Zeus feels a kind of compunction in allowing Hector to be slain, who has offered him so many welcome gifts, and so many victims upon the altar.[2] Whether supplication was answered, or not, was contingent on the will of the divinities, which was determined not so much by general grounds of reason, or justice, as by personal favor, or disfavor. Moreover, the gods might resist and baffle one another, and so disappoint the hopes of the suppliant. Then to what god should a man in trouble resort? Which particular divinity was frowning upon him? The distracting effect of polytheism is constantly apparent in Homer. Resignation becomes a passive acquiescence in what is inevitably ordained. It is far removed from an active, cordial submission to the behest of a higher wisdom. Power eclipses the other attributes of divinity. Hence, the sufferer breaks out in loud complaints against the deities. Agamemnon more than once asserts that Zeus has cheated him. Menelaus, when his sword breaks in the duel with Paris, cries:—

> "O Father Jove! thou art of all the gods
> The most unfriendly."[3]

[1] See Nägelsbach, 175. In only one passage is an image of a god in a temple referred to, (Il. vi. 92).

[2] Il. xxiv. 91-95.

[3] Ζεῦ πάτερ, οὔτις σεῖο θεῶν ὀλοώτερος ἄλλος·—Il. iii. 365 (Bryant, iii. 447-448).

This scolding of the gods on the part of men is for the most part, if not uniformly, directed against Zeus.[1]

In the Homeric system, morality is interwoven with religion. Justice and the fear of the gods are involved in each other. The heroes are simple and frank in the avowal of their feelings. When they are smitten with sorrow, they weep. Thus Achilles weeps aloud over Patroclus, and Ulysses and Telemachus weep aloud in each other's embrace. Truthfulness is prized. Achilles declares that he who hides one thing in his heart, and utters another with his lips, is as hateful to him as the gates of hell.[2] So there is a sense of honor and of shame, which rise above the dread of censure, and spring from an ideal of worthy character. Above all, oaths are sacred, and oath-breakers detested by gods and men. The ties of affection, where they subsist, are peculiarly tender. Many passages of the deepest pathos, in the Iliad and Odyssey, are linked to this theme. The power of friendship is displayed in the relation of Achilles and Patroclus. Monogamy prevailed among the Greeks. The attachment of husband and wife to one another is deep and fervent. On the whole subject of the relation of the sexes, an air of purity and innocence pervades the Homeric poems. Maidenly modesty is held in honor. The wife must be faithful to her husband. The husband, though he may have concubines, is bound to the wife by a higher and an indissoluble tie. Only death dissolves their connection. The wife, though she may be acquired by purchase, is not a slave, but a companion, and, with certain qualifications, an equal. Homer has much to say of the silence and compliance that befit woman; but his female personages, whether divine or human, exercise a high degree of practical freedom in speech. In the stories of Hector and Andromache, Ulysses and Penelope, we have pic-

[1] Nägelsbach does not admit any exception, p. 194. [2] Il. ix. 386-388.

tures of refined domestic love. Ulysses says to Nausicaa :—

> "There is no better, no more blessed state,
> Than when the wife and husband in accord
> Order their household lovingly." [1]

The thoughts of the wounded Sarpedon revert to his "dear wife and little son." [2] Helen, to express the depth of her attachment to Hector, tells him that he is "father and dear mother" now to her. One of the most pathetic touches in the lament of Andromache, is the reflection that Hector had not been permitted to speak a word of comfort to her, on which she might think, day and night, with tears.[3] The heart of Ulysses melted within him as he clasped his aged father to his breast. The Homeric poems abound in kindred references to the strength and tenderness of parental, filial, and conjugal love. Even the lot of the slave was softened in families where the patriarchal system prevailed ; although it is said that the day that makes a man a slave takes away half of his worth. The minstrel, and the aged, have a right to kindness and protection.

As concerns the treatment of enemies and the feelings excited by injury, we find abundant examples of unbridled anger and savage retaliation. On the battle-field of Troy, the heroes rage, much in the temper of the wolves, and wild boars, and ravenous lions, to which they are so often likened. They often deny quarter to the suppliant, and exult over his fallen body. Agamemnon advises Menelaus to spare not a life among the Trojans :—

> "The very babe within his mother's womb,
> Even that must die." [4]

[1] —— *οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ γε κρεῖσσον καὶ ἄρειον,*
ἢ ὅθ' ὁμοφρονέοντε νοήμασιν οἶκον ἔχητον
ἀνὴρ ἠδὲ γυνή.—Od. vi. 182–184 (Bryant, vi. 229–232).

[2] Il. v. 860-862.

[3] Il. xxiv. 945-946.

[4] —— *μηδ' ὄντινα γαστέρι μήτηρ*
Κοῦρον ἐόντα φέροι, μηδ' ὃς φύγοι·
—Il. vi. 58-59 (Bryant, vi. 73-74).

Yet gentle sentiments are not wanting; and it is a mistake, even in reference to the early stages of the Greek religion, to affirm that forbearance and forgiveness are wholly unknown. Magnanimity and mercy could never be imported into human nature, if some sparks of placable feeling were not native to the human soul. Peleus had warned Achilles that "gentle ways are best," and bidden him "to keep aloof from sharp contentions."[1] Agamemnon points to Pluto as the god who never relents, and pronounces him, on this account, of all the divinities, "most hateful to men." Patroclus was admired as a model of gentleness. Even Achilles, in a better mood, exclaims:

—— "Would that Strife
Might perish among gods and men, with Wrath,
Which makes even wise men cruel, and, though sweet
At first as dropping honey, growing, fills
The heart with its foul smoke."[2]

Achilles will not be appeased, and never tires of inflicting vengeance, not sparing the dead body of his foe, and slaying twelve Trojans upon the funeral pile of Patroclus. But the wrath of Achilles is the subject of the Iliad. His immitigable anger is not held up for approbation, but rather as an object of censure, and even of loathing. The duty of forbearance is made to rest upon religious motives. The finest illustration of this whole subject is the exquisite speech which Phœnix made, "with many sighs and tears," to Achilles. After referring to his own tender nurture of the hero in his childhood, and to the hopes he had cherished respecting him, he exhorts him to subdue his spirit:—

[1] Il. ix. 318-319.

[2] ὡς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν, ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο,
καὶ χόλος, ὅστ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπῆναι·
ὅς τε πολὺ γλυκίων μέλιτος καταλειβομένοιο
ἀνδρῶν ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀέξεται, ἠΰτε καπνός·
—Il. xviii. 106–110 (Bryant, xviii. 137–140).

"Ill it becomes thee to be merciless:
The gods themselves are placable, though far
Above us all in honor and in power
And virtue. We propitiate them with vows,
Incense, libations, and burnt offerings,
And prayers for those who have offended."[1]

This may remind us of the eulogy of Mercy which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of Portia, and of her argument: "We do pray for mercy."

The obligations of hospitality form a part of the Homeric code of duty. The guest is treated with a chivalrous courtesy; his name is not even asked until he has sated his hunger at the table; and when he departs he is dismissed with gifts. The stranger and the poor man are under the special guardianship of Zeus, who will punish any who ill treat them, or refuse to befriend them. When one arrives on a foreign shore, his first anxiety is to know whether the people among whom he is to be thrown are "god-fearing." The duty of civil loyalty has a prominent place. Regal government is held to be the right form, as contrasted with the rule of the many, which is regarded with low esteem. The king receives his authority from Zeus; insubordination in the subject has the character of impiety. International rights, any farther than they are created by treaty, have no recognition. The war of Troy gives rise to leagues, truces, confederacies. But war is waged for purposes of revenge, or for robbery and plunder; and is barbarous in its laws and usages.

5. *Sin and Atonement.*—The wrath of the gods is less

[1] ἀλλ', Ἀχιλεῦ, δάμασον θυμὸν μέγαν· οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
νηλεὲς ἦτορ ἔχειν. στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοί,
τῶνπερ καὶ μείζων ἀρετὴ τιμή τε βίη τε.
καὶ μὲν τοὺς ὑνέεσσι καὶ εὐχωλῆς ἀγανῆσιν,
λοιβῇ τε κνίσσῃ τε, παρατρωπῶσ' ἄνθρωποι
λισσόμενοι, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβήῃ καὶ ἁμάρτῃ.
—Il. ix. 496–501 (Bryant, ix. 617–622).

excited by offences against themselves directly, although these bring punishment upon the trangressor, than by infractions of the moral order, such as impiety towards parents, cruelty to the stranger and to the poor, the infidelity of a wife to her husband.[1] The lawless self-assertion and insolence—ὕβρις—out of which wrongs of this character spring, is what calls down in a marked degree the divine displeasure. This temper provokes punishment at the hands of gods and men. Sin is an infatuation. The mind is deluded; and this delusion of the understanding is attributed to an influence from the gods themselves. A Satanic element belongs to the divinities, and thus the feeling of responsibility is lessened. Among the chief motives to right conduct are the impulses of conscience, the sense of shame, dread of public opinion, the example of the gods, and the fear of punishment from them. A belief in the punitive righteousness of the gods is deeply ingrained in the Homeric man. There is an abiding conviction that "wrong prospers not" (Od. i. 165). The destruction of Troy is decreed, because the Greeks had justice on their side in the original quarrel, and because the Trojans broke the Treaty. The rapacious and insolent suitors of Penelope were slain by the men whose rights they had invaded. Then Laertes cries:—

> "O Father Jove, assuredly the gods
> Dwell on the Olympian height, since we behold
> The arrogant suitors punished for their crimes."[2]

The divine justice exerts itself in the retribution that alights on individual evil-doers. More is said of the punishment of the wicked than of the reward of the good.

[1] See Nägelsbach, p. 269.

[2] Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ῥα ἔτ' ἐστε θεοὶ κατὰ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον,
εἰ ἐτεὸν μνηστῆρες ἀτάσθαλον ὕβριν ἔτισαν.
Od. xxiv. 351-352 (Bryant, xxiv. 426-428).

Sin is confessed. Agamemnon frankly acknowledges his faults. Helen speaks of herself as

"Lost to shame, and cause of many ills." [1]

She laments that she was not, at her birth, whirled away by the blast, or swallowed up by the sea. She alludes to the labors of Hector,

"For one so vile as I and for the sake of guilty Paris." [2]

Agamemnon speaks of her as having brought dishonor

"On women, even the faithful and the good;" [3]

and she is not without a painful consciousness of the infamy that awaits her.

The sense of sin against the gods gives rise to the need of pardon and reconciliation. The offended deity is approached with offerings, attended with prayer. The sacrifices are not presented as symbolical of the penalty incurred by the transgressor, as if this were transferred to the animal. They are rather gifts to the god, which gratify him, and imply an acknowledgment of his power, and of the honor due to him. But as the gods are actuated by no steady and impartial love to men, as they are not merciful and gracious on principle, the suppliant has no certainty that his suit for pardon is effectual. The divinity may turn a deaf ear to his petition, and spurn his offering. And there are crimes which are unpardonable, from the penalties of which there is no room for deliverance.

6. *Life, Death and Immortality.*—It is a prevalent error to suppose that the ancients regarded human life as a

[1] —κυνὸς κακομηχάνου, ὀκρυοέσσης.—Il. vi. 344 (Bryant, vi. 449).

[2] εἵνεκ' ἐμεῖο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἕνεκ' ἄτης.
Il. vi. 356 (Bryant, vi. 462-463).

[3] —χαλεπὴν δέ τε φῆμιν ὀπάσσει
θηλυτέρῃσι γυναιξί, καὶ ἥ κ' εὐεργὸς ἔησιν.
Od. xxiv. 202-3 (Bryant, xxiv. 252).

scene of joy. The ancient writers are full of reflections of an opposite character. Zeus himself is made to say, that

> "The race of mortal men
> Of all that breathe and move upon the earth
> Is the most wretched." [1]

Laments and complaints relative to the hard lot of mortals, of various classes of men, and of individuals, are frequent on the pages of Homer. Fortune deserts the hero at the moment of seeming triumph. He becomes the victim of his own success. Nor is there any faith in a wise and merciful Providence that orders all things, and can make evil the occasion of good. Death offers no hope except that of a respite from anguish, or rest from pain. Its blessing is purely negative. The dead in Hades are spectres—ghostly images of the bodies worn on earth—groping about in the dark, with only a feeble remnant of their former life and intelligence. The soul is so identified with the body that there can be no conception of immortality without it. The departed heroes, who converse with Ulysses, must first drink blood in order to exercise the faculties of intelligence and memory. Achilles says to him:—

> "I would be
> A laborer on earth, and serve for hire
> Some man of mean estate, who makes scant cheer
> Rather than reign o'er all who have gone down
> To death." [2]

There is no positive punishment in Hades, except for

[1] *οὐ μὲν γάρ τί πού ἐστιν ὀϊζυρώτερον ἀνδρὸς*
πάντων, ὅσσα τε γαῖαν ἐπι πνείει τε καὶ ἕρπει.
Il. xvii. 446–447 (Bryant, xvii. 537-539).

[2] *βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἐὼν θητευέμεν ἄλλῳ,*
ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ, ᾧ μὴ βίοτος πολὺς εἴη,
ἢ πᾶσιν νεκύεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν.
Od. xi. 489–491 (Bryant, 602–606).

perjurers; but there is, likewise, no reward. It is a region of flitting shadows; an abode of hopeless gloom. Menelaus, the favorite of the gods, was to be saved from this dismal lot, because his body was to be transported alive to the Elysian fields. Death, except for those whose sufferings had made existence itself a burden, was deprecated as an unmitigated curse.

In this outline of the Homeric theology, we have pointed out an incipient tendency to monotheism, in the patriarchal supremacy of Zeus over the Olympian family, and, further, in the half-defined notion of an all-governing fate. We have found no conception of a Providence which might serve as a warrant for resignation under calamities, and for the hope of good to emerge out of evil. Nor is there a divine Love, to attract the rational confidence and reciprocal affection of men. There is, however, a moral government on the part of the gods; a condemnation and punishment of injustice; but even this conception is clouded and disfigured by stories of crime and folly in the conduct of the gods themselves, and by particular instances of treachery and injustice in their dealings with individuals. And the Homeric religion kindles no consoling hope that reaches beyond the grave.

When we pass from Homer to Sophocles, we find ourselves in a vastly purer atmosphere of moral and religious feeling. How numerous are the passages in this incomparable poet which might fitly be incorporated in Christian teaching! In the great writers who flourished in the glorious manhood of Greek life, under Athenian institutions, the less worthy conceptions of the primitive age retreat into the background, while the nobler features of the popular creed attain to a full development.

1. The gods are still conceived of as clothed in corporeal

form. Art gives to this form an ideal perfection. Their images abide in their temples; and it is felt that when the image is taken away, the god forsakes his abode. But the divinities are no longer, as in Homer, obliged to be physically present where their power is exerted. They can act from afar. There is a much more exalted notion of their might, as well as of their knowledge. Teucros, in the Ajax of Sophocles, says of the fatal belt and sword of Hector:—

> "I must needs own the gods as working this,
> And all things else that come to mortal
> Men." [1]

Xenophon, in the Anabasis, makes Clearchus say to Tissaphernes that he who violates an oath can never be happy, "for whoever becomes the object of divine wrath, I know no swiftness can save him, no darkness hide him, no strong place defend him; since, in all places, all things are subject to the power of the gods, and everywhere they are equally lords of all."[2]

Pindar speaks of

> "God, that o'ertakes the eagle's wing
> And leaves the dolphin's haste behind
> In the mid sea; whose chastening hand hath bow'd
> The lofty spirit of the proud,
> And given to modest worth the imperishable crown." [3]

and in another place:—

[1] *ἐγὼ μὲν ἂν καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ πάντ' ἀεὶ*
φάσκοιμ' ἂν ἀνθρώποισι μηχανᾶν θεούς.
Ajax, 1036–1037.

[2] *τὸν γὰρ θεῶν πόλεμον οὐκ οἶδα οὔτ' ἀπὸ ποίου ἂν τάχους φεύγων τις ἀποφύγοι οὔτ' εἰς ποῖον ἂν σκότος ἀποδραίη οὔθ' ὅπως ἂν εἰς ἐχυρὸν χωρίον ἀποσταίη.* Anab. ii. 5, 7.

[3] *θεός, ὃ καὶ πτερόεντ' αἰετὸν κίχε, καὶ θαλασσαῖον παραμείβεται*
δελφῖνα, καὶ ὑψιφρόνων τιν' ἐκαμψε βροτῶν,
ἑτέροισι δὲ κῦδος ἀγήραον παρέδωκ.'
Pyth. ii., Str. ii.

"Vain hope, that guilt by time or place,
Can 'scape the searching glance of heaven." [1]

The monotheistic tendency is conspicuously manifest in this period. The "gods" are spoken of collectively, in relation to acts of divine government, as if a single agency or intelligence were in the mind of the writer. This is often observed in Demosthenes. The word "god" is used in the singular number, when no particular divinity is meant, as if there were an obscure sense of one presiding, governing mind. These modes of speech are not unfrequent in the dramatic poets, in moments of deep feeling. Moreover, the regal domination of Zeus, as the centre of divine power and authority, receives a new emphasis. He is clothed with the attributes of might resistless, of wisdom, of fatherhood, of truthfulness, and immaculate, unsleeping justice. Hermes, in "Prometheus Bound," speaks thus:

—— "the lips
Of Zeus know not to speak a lying speech,
But will perform each single word." [2]

In the "Seven against Thebes," Justice is called "Zeus's Virgin Child." Elsewhere, in Æschylus, he is styled

"Guardian of the just man's dwelling;" [3]

and, in the same drama,

—— "Our Father, author of our life,
The King, whose right hand worketh all his will." [4]

[1] —εἰ δὲ θεὸν ἀνήρ τις ἔλπεταί τι λαθέμεν ἔρδων, ἁμαρτάνει.
—Olymp. i., Str. ii.

[2] ψευδηγορεῖν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπίσταται στόμα
τὸ Δῖον, ἀλλὰ πᾶν ἔπος τελεῖ.—Prometh. Vinct. 1053–1054.

[3] —— οἰκοφύλαξ
ὁσίων ἀνδρῶν.—Suppliants, 26–27.

[4] πατὴρ φυτουργὸς, αὐτόχειρ ἀναξ
γένους παλαιόφρων μέγας
τέκτων, τὸ πᾶν μῆχαρ οὔριος Ζευς·—Suppliants, 586–588.

In Sophocles, Zeus is addressed (in the Œdipus at Colonos) as

——"Lord omnipotent of gods,
Who all on earth beholdest." [1]

Beside his throne dwells

"The eternal Right that rests on oldest laws." [2]

The chorus thus consoles Electra:

"Mighty in heaven he dwells,
Zeus, seeing, guiding all." [3]

There is

"nothing which Zeus works not." [4]

In the theology of this era, Fate (Moira) becomes subordinate to Zeus, whose will is supreme; but afterwards, Fate is identified with Fortune, (Tyche), and then, in the period of decline, this Power is placed behind and above all.

The gods, especially Zeus, are the fountain of law. In Æschylus, we read of

"Law sprung from Zeus, supreme Apportioner." [5]

And a part of the law guards the right of the suppliant. Here belongs the memorable passage in the Antigone of Sophocles:

"Nor did I deem thy edicts strong enough
That thou, a mortal man, should'st over-pass
The unwritten laws of God that know not change.
They are not of to-day nor yesterday,

[1] ὦ Ζεῦ, πάνταρχ',
ὦ παντόπτα.—Œd. Col., 1085–1086.

[2] ——— εἴπερ ἐστὶν ἡ παλαίφατος
Δίκη ξύνεδρος Ζηνὸς ἀρχαιοῖς νόμοις.—Œd. Col., 1382–1383.

[3] ἔτι μέγας οὐρανῷ
Ζεὺς, ὃς ἐφορᾷ πάντα καὶ κρατύνει·—Electra, 174–175.

[4] κοὐδὲν τούτων ὅ τι μὴ Ζεύς.—Maidens of Trachis, 1278.

[5] —θέμις Διὸς κλαρίου.—Suppliants, 354.

But live forever, nor can man assign
When first they sprang to being." [1]

Parallel with this is the splendid passage in the Ajax upon the sovereignty of law over winter, and night, and storm—over the mightiest things in nature, and by analogy, over human feeling and conduct. [2] There are not wanting assertions of the tenderness of Zeus; as in "the Maidens of Trachis:"—

"—Who hath known in Zeus forgetfulness
Of those he children calls." [3]

It must be remembered that we have here the highest thoughts of the Greek mind upon divine things. It must not be supposed that this lofty mood was uniformly maintained even by the few; much less, that it was diffused among the multitude, on whom the Homeric theology retained a firm hold. On the contrary, the doubts of the divine rectitude, which are uttered in Æschylus and Sophocles, must not be taken as habitual to the poets themselves. They represent the occasional questionings and perplexities which sprang up in view of the mysteries of life. A similar struggle with doubt meets us in Job and in Ecclesiastes.

Perhaps the most striking feature of the Greek popular faith, as reflected in the classic writers, is the righteousness of the divine government, evinced, in particular, in the punishment of evil-doers. Not the worst men alone, as in Homer, but transgressors generally, are punished in Hades, as well as on earth. Retribution surely, though it may be slow, overtakes the guilty. The idea that "if the millstones

[1] οὐδὲ σθένειν τοσοῦτον ᾠόμην τὰ σὰ
κηρύγματ', ὥστ' ἀγραπτα κἀσφαλῆ θεῶν
νόμιμα δύνασθαι θνητὸν ὄνθ' ὑπερδραμεῖν.
οὐ γάρ τι νῦν γε κἀχθές, ἀλλ' ἀεί ποτε
ζῇ ταῦτα, κοὐδεὶς οἶδεν ἐξ ὅτου 'φάνη.—Antig., 453-457.

[2] Ajax, 668-678.

[3] —ἐπεὶ τίς ὧδε
τέκνοισι Ζῆν' ἀβουλον εἶδεν.—Maidens of Trachis, 139-140.

of the gods grind slow, they grind fine," was cherished, long before it was coined into a proverb. The Greek tragedies would be emasculated, were they deprived of this pervading element. That which especially calls down the vengeance of the gods is haughty self-assertion, breaking through the bounds of law; the pride and insolence, which are expressed in the word ὕβρις. Zeus is called, in "the Persians" of Æschylus, "the avenger of o'er lofty thoughts." [1] The ghost of Darius sends the admonition to Xerxes,

"To cease his daring sacrilegious pride,"[2]

and predicts that the slaughter of Platæa will

—— "witness to the eyes of men
That mortal man should not wax over-proud;
For wanton pride from blossom grows to fruit,
The full corn in the ear, of utter woe,
And reaps a tear-fraught harvest." [3]

The daring transgressor, who tramples on justice,

—— "as time wears on
Will have to take in sail,
When trouble makes him hers, and each yard-arm
Is shivered by the blast." [4]

Then he will call in vain for help, and, in the midst of "woes inextricable," [5] will make shipwreck of his happi-

[1] Ζεύς τοι κολαστὴς τῶν ὑπερκόμπων ἄγαν
φρονημάτων ἔπεστιν.—Persians, 823, 824.

[2] λῆξαι θεοβλαβοῦνθ' ὑπερκόμπῳ θράσει.—Persians, 827.

[3] —— σημανοῦσιν ὄμμασιν βροτῶν
ὡς οὐχ ὑπέρφευ θνητὸν ὄντα χρὴ φρονεῖν.
ὕβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσ' ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν
ἄτης, ὅθεν πάγκλαυτον ἐξαμᾶ θέρος.—Persians, 815–818.

[4] τὸν ἀντίτολμον δὲ φαμὶ καὶ παραιβάτον
τὰ πολλὰ παντόφυρτ' ἄνευ δίκας
βιαίως ξὺν χρόνῳ καθήσειν
λαῖφος, ὅταν λάβῃ πόνος,
θρανομένας κεραίας.—Eumenides, 523–527.

[5] ἐν μέσᾳ
δυσπαλεῖ τε δίνᾳ.—Ibid. 528, 529.

ness. The feeling of Sophocles on this subject is expressed in the Œdipus Tyrannus, in the words:—

"But pride begets the mood
Of wanton, tyrant power;
Pride filled with many thoughts, yet filled in vain,
Untimely, ill-advised,
Scaling the topmost height,
Falls to the abyss of woe." [1]

The "Antigone" winds up with the moral from the chorus:—

"Man's highest blessedness,
In wisdom chiefly stands;
And in the things that touch upon the gods,
'Tis best in word or deed,
To shun unholy pride;
Great words of boasting bring great punishments,
And so to grey-haired age
Teach wisdom at the last." [2]

In the Ajax the same injunction is enforced:—

"Nor boast thyself, though thou excel in strength,
Or weight of stored-up wealth. All human things,
A day lays low, a day lifts up again;
But still the gods love those of ordered soul,
And hate the evil." [3]

[1] ὕβρις φυτεύει τύραννον·
ὕβρις, εἰ πολλῶν ὑπερπλησθῇ μάταν,
ἃ μὴ 'πίκαιρα μηδὲ συμφέροντα,
ἀκρότατον εἰσαναβασ'
[αἶπος] ἀπότομον ὥρουσεν εἰς ἀνάγκαν,
ἔνθ' οὐ ποδὶ χρησίμῳ
χρῆται.—Œd. Rex., 873-879.

[2] πολλῷ τὸ φρονεῖν εὐδαιμονίας
πρῶτον ὑπάρχει· χρὴ δ' ἐς τοὺς θεοὺς
μηδὲν ἀσεπτεῖν· μεγάλοι δε λόγοι
μεγάλας πληγὰς τῶν ὑπεραύχων
ἀποτίσαντες
γήρᾳ τὸ φρονεῖν ἐδίδαξεν.—Antig., 1348–1353.

[3] μηδ' ὄγκον ἄρῃ μηδέν', εἰ τινος πλέον
ἢ χειρὶ βρίθεις ἢ μακροῦ πλούτου βάθει.
ὡς ἡμέρα κλίνει τε κἀνάγει πάλιν
ἅπαντα τἀνθρώπεια· τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας
θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακούς.—Ajax, 129–133.

There is no escape from punishment for any form of iniquity. Pindar ends a verse in a strain that reminds one of the First Psalm :—

"While he that walks sin's wandering way,
Ends not in bliss the changeful day." [1]

The criminal is followed by

"Vengeance, with hands that bear
The might of righteousness." [2]

If the murderer were to escape, atheism would be the result :—

"For if the dead, as dust and nothing found,
Shall lie there in his woe,
And they shall fail to pay
The penalty of blood,
Then should all fear of gods from earth decay,
And all men's worship prove a thing of naught." [3]

Such lofty and inspiring sentiments place their authors far above the nominally Christian writers who have felt the enervating breath of a materialistic or Pantheistic creed. Unhappily these sentiments are connected with other notions which operated to diminish their proper influence. The doctrine of an all-controlling Fate was one of these counteracting forces. The idea was entertained that a taint might cling to a particular family, like the race of Atreus, and blight one generation after another of its members. The Homeric theology contained the idea that the gods themselves tempt to sin, and spread a net to

[1] *οὐχ ὁμῶς πάντα χρόνον θαλλῶν ὁμιλεῖ.*—Isth. iii., Str. i.

[2] *Δίκα, δίκαια φερομένα χεροῖν κράτη·*—Electra, 476.

[3] *εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν θανὼν γᾶ τε καὶ οὐδὲν ὢν*
κείσεται τάλας
οἱ δὲ μὴ πάλιν
δώσουςʼ ἀντιφόνους δίκας,
ἔρροι τʼ ἂν αἰδὼς
ἁπάντων τʼ εὐσέβεια θνατῶν.—Electra, 244-250.

ensnare the objects of their dislike. This idea gradually disappeared from Greek thought, at least as far as its best representatives are concerned. But pure faith in a moral government was adulterated by the theory of Nemesis, which pursues the prosperous to their hurt and ruin. There is a certain measure of happiness which the gods accord to mortals. Whoever surpasses this measure is destined to have the cup dashed from his lips. The feeling that leads the peculiarly fortunate, at the height of their felicity, to be haunted with the apprehension of a reverse of fortune, might arise from the observation of life, and from an experience of the fact that the lot of men is mixed. But the Greeks held that the function of Nemesis goes beyond the chastisement of pride, and the punishment of prosperous ill-desert. The gods look with envy and disapproval upon the happiness of mortals, however innocent the sources of it may be, when it rises higher than a moderate limit. Herodotus dwells upon this idea. He tells the tale of Polycrates who, in consequence of his uninterrupted good fortune, threw his ring into the sea, that he might ward off greater disasters with which the envy of the gods might visit him.[1] The story of Crœsus which Herodotus narrates at length, is one of the marked illustrations of the vicissitude of fortune which is produced by the resentment of the gods. Æschylus is a witness to the prevalence of the tenet in a passage in which he expresses his own dissent from it:—

> "There lives an old saw, framed in ancient days,
> In memories of men, that high estate
> Full-grown brings forth its young, nor childless dies,
> But that from good success
> Springs to the race a woe insatiable.
> But I, apart from all,
> Hold this my creed alone:

[1] Book iii. 42 seq.

For impious act it is that offspring breeds
Like to their parent stock:
For still in every house
That loves the right their fate for evermore
Rejoiceth in an issue fair and good."[1]

So deeply seated among the ancients was the sense of the instability of fortune, as springing from the refusal of the divinities to tolerate in mortals a degree of happiness that seemed to encroach on their peculiar privilege, that a skeptic like Julius Cæsar, on the evening when he made his triumphant entry into Rome, as master of the world, crawled upon his knees up the steps of the capitol to make a propitiatory offering to Nemesis.

2. The number of the divinities is multiplied as time advances. The personifying impulse is not disposed to rest. Every perennial force, whether material or spiritual, is endowed with personal agency. Xerxes lashes the Hellespont, as an act of punishment. Xenophon, on his retreat with the ten thousand, placates Boreas who blew fiercely in the faces of his men.[2] As the gods become more exalted, intermediate powers are introduced as their agents, to span the gulf that separates the higher divinities from men. The cultus of the heroes, children of the gods or goddesses, grows in importance. The honors paid to the dead assume gradually the form of worship, the ceremonies of which are performed at their burial places. Below the gods, and along

[1] παλαίφατος δ' ἐν βροτοῖς γέρων λόγος
τέτυκται, μέγαν τελεσθέντα φωτὸς ὄλβον
τεκνοῦσθαι, μηδ' ἄπαιδα θνήσκειν·
ἐκ δ'ἀγαθᾶς τύχας γένει
βλαστάνειν ἀκόρεστον οἰζύν.
δίχα δ' ἄλλων μονόφρων εἰμί· τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον
μέτα μὲν πλείονα τίκτει, σφετέρᾳ δ' εἰκότα γέννᾳ.
οἴκων γὰρ εὐθυδίκων
καλλίπαις πότμος αἰεί.—Agamemnon, 727-737.

[2] Anab., iv. 5. 4.

with the heroes, are the demons, subordinate divinities, the instruments of divine intercourse with the world. Some of them are good, and some evil. The old methods of ascertaining the will of the gods, such as the movement of high-flying birds, which are near the sky, and atmospheric phenomena, as thunder and lightning, were still in vogue. Added to these supernatural signs, were the omens gathered from an inspection of the entrails of animals, it being supposed that the deity presided over the selection of them for sacrifice, and thus made known his mind. So, accidental occurrences, like the sudden, unexpected meeting of persons, and the test of the lot, had their religious interpretation. There was direct revelation, too, by prophecy, sometimes, as in the case of Cassandra in Æschylus, uttered in the ecstatic mood—the furor divinus—and sometimes, as in the case of Calchas and Tiresias, without this abnormal excitement. Oracles acquired a new and vast importance; and these are to be considered as mainly the fruit of enthusiasm, not of imposture. The oracle of Delphi exercised a great political influence, as exemplified in relation to such events as the battle of Marathon, and the creation of the Athenian marine. Its prestige naturally vanished with the downfall of Greek liberty, after it began, as Demosthenes expressed it, "to philippize," or to yield its authority to corrupt inducements.

3. The visible objects of religious regard were multiplied under the mingled impulses of art and piety, and the rites of worship ramified in all directions. The Apostle Paul found in Athens, on every hand, signs of an excess of devotion. The temples and households were filled with images of the gods. Sacred processions, festivals, amusements in which religious observances formed a part, were of constant occurrence. There were prayers in the family; thanks were rendered after meals, and in connection with

all such events as marriages, births, and safe returns from a journey. With expiatory sacrifices, ceremonies of purification, as lustrations, are connected,—a step in advance of Homer. The need of sincerity and spiritual feeling in approaches to the gods, was understood by thoughtful minds. They understood, too, that the conduct of the worshipper must be consistent with his act of devotion. Says Œdipus, in Sophocles :—

> "I pray ye, by the Gods, as ye have raised me,
> So now deliver me, nor, with outward show
> Honoring the Gods, then count the Gods as naught;
> But think that they behold the godly soul,
> Beholding, too, the godless: never yet
> Was refuge found for impious child of man." [1]

It is only in the case of human sacrifices, as in the memorable example of Iphigeneia, or in offerings substituted for these, that the idea of vicarious expiation appears. And human sacrifices, though they reach down into historical times, were more and more repugnant to Greek feeling. Glimpses of a truth not clearly defined to the author's own mind, occasionally appear; as in the Œdipus at Colonos, where we read :—

> "For one soul working in the strength of love
> Is mightier than ten thousand to atone." [2]

Excellence of character centred in *σωφροσύνη*,—the principle of moderation and self-government, through which

[1] *ἀνθ' ὧν ἱκνοῦμαι πρὸς θεῶν ὑμᾶς, ξένοι,*
ὥσπερ με κἀνεστήσασθ' ὧδε σώσατε,
καὶ μὴ θεοὺς τιμῶντες εἶτα τοὺς θεοὺς
μοίρᾳ ποιεῖσθε μηδαμῶς· ἡγεῖσθε δὲ
βλέπειν μὲν αὐτούς πρὸς τὸν εὐσεβῆ βροτῶν,
βλέπειν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς δυσσεβεῖς, φυγὴν δέ του
μήπω γενέσθαι φωτὸς ἀνοσίου.—Œd. at Col., 275-281.

[2] *ἀρκεῖν γὰρ οἶμαι κἀντὶ μυρίων μίαν*
ψυχὴν τάδ' ἐκτίνουσαν, ἣν εὔνους παρῇ.
Œd. at Col. 499.

the individual keeps within limits, both as concerns others, and as regards the inward subordination of the parts of his own nature. This spirit involves temperance, or the due control of the appetites of sense, and justice which gives to the neighbor his due. In the tragedians and other classic writers of that period, the stern spirit of law prevails, and the requital of injuries is approved. Curses are poured out on enemies. Œdipus exclaims:—

"I did but requite the wrongs I suffered," [1]

and Creon says:

"I claim the right of rendering ill for ill." [2]

It was reserved for philosophy, at a later date, to broach a milder doctrine. Yet placableness and forbearance were not unknown to the Greeks of an earlier day. Thus Oceanus reminds Prometheus that "wise words are the healers of wrath." Ulysses says of Ajax:—

"I know of no man, and I pity him,
So wretched now, although mine enemy,
So tied and harnessed to an evil fate,
And thinking that it touches me as well;
For this I see that we, all we that live
Are but vain phantoms, shadows fleeting fast." [3]

At Athens, there was public provision for orphans and for the help of the poor. Feelings of compassion for the destitute, the aged, and the suffering, find beautiful expression in the best Greek literature.

[1] ὅστις παθὼν μὲν ἀντέδρων.—Œd. at Col. 271.
[2] ἀνθ' ὧν πεπονθὼς ἠξίουν τάδ' ἀντιδρᾶν.—Œd. at Col., 953.
[3] ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδέν' οἶδ'. ἐποικτείρω δέ νιν
δύστηνον ἔμπας, καίπερ ὄντα δυσμενῆ,
ὀθούνεκ' ἄτῃ συγκατέζευκται κακῇ,
οὐδὲν τὸ τούτου μᾶλλον ἢ τοὐμὸν σκοπῶν.
ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν
εἴδωλ' ὅσοιπερ ζῶμεν ἢ κούφην σκιάν.—Ajax, 121-126.

Scattered up and down the poets are pathetic utterances of kindly feeling. Œdipus is touched with sorrow for others. He says:—

—"To use our means, our power,
In doing good, is noblest service owned." [1]

Theseus compassionates Œdipus, having been himself reared away from home, and having gone through many struggles. From no stranger in distress would he draw back; for, he says,

"I know that I am man, and I can count
No more than thou, on what the morrow brings." [2]

Œdipus feels that

—"They alone
Can feel for mourners who themselves have mourned." [3]

Deianeira in "The Maidens of Trachis" is smitten with compassion at the sight of captives:—

—"Sad pity creeps on me,
My friends, when I behold these wretched ones
In a strange land as homeless, fatherless;
And they who sprang, perchance, from free-born sires,
Now lead the life of bond-slaves." [4]

[1] ἄνδρα δ' ὠφελεῖν ἀφ' ὧν
ἔχοι τε καὶ δύναιτο κάλλιστος πόνων.—Œd. Rex, 315.

[2] ξξοιδ' ἀνὴρ ὢν χὠτι τῆς ἐς αὔριον
οὐδὲν πλέον μοι σοῦ μέτεστιν ἡμέρας.
Œd. at Col., 567-568.

[3] τοῖς γὰρ ἐμπείροις βροτῶν
μόνοις οἷόν τε συνταλαιπωρεῖν τάδε.
Œd. at Col., 1135-1136.

[4] ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἰκτος δεινὸς εἰσέβη, φίλαι,
ταύτας ὁρώσῃ, δυσπότμους ἐπὶ ξένης
χώρας ἀοίκους ἀπάτορᾶς τ' ἀλωμένας,
αἳ πρὶν μὲν ἦσαν ἐξ ἐλευθέρων ἴσως
ἀνδρῶν, τανῦν δὲ δοῦλον ἴσχουσιν βίον.
Maidens of Trachis, 298-302.

In contracting marriage, the female was passive; it was held to be her duty to live in retirement and in submission to her husband; the rule of divorce was extremely lax, nor was the man, like the woman, held to be bound to connubial fidelity. Yet the idea of a higher relation of fellowship and equality between husband and wife is not wholly wanting. Nothing can exceed the beauty of many passages in Æschylus and Sophocles, which touch upon the reciprocal love of parents and children, and brothers and sisters. Ismene, in Œdipus at Colonos, cries out:—

"My father and my sister!
Of all names sweetest." [1]

Clytemnestra exclaims:—

"Though wronged, a mother cannot hate her children." [2]

Electra speaks sorrowfully of Orestes, and of

—"All the nurture, now so profitless,
Which I was wont with sweetest toil to give
For thee, my brother." [3]

The subordination of the citizen to the state merged every other duty in patriotism. The Greek acknowledged the bond that united him to other branches of the Hellenic race; but between the Greek and the barbarian a great gulf was set. The former, in the proud consciousness of superior gifts of nature, of a higher culture, and of more humane customs, denied to the rest of mankind the consideration which he accorded to the people of his own

[1] ὦ δισσὰ πατρὸς καὶ κασιγνήτης ἐμοὶ
ἥδιστα προσφωνήματ'.—Œd. at Col., 324–325.

[2] οὐδὲ γὰρ κακῶς
πάσχοντι, μῖσος ὢν τέκη προσγίγνεται.—Electra, 770-771.

[3] οἰμοι τάλαινα τῆς ἐμῆς πάλαι τροφῆς
ἀνωφελήτου, τὴν ἐγὼ θάμ' ἀμφὶ σοὶ
πόνῳ γλυκεῖ παρέσχον.—Electra, 1143-1145.

lineage. After the attempt to enslave Greece, which led to the Persian wars, the hostility of Greeks to barbarians became a traditional sentiment. Greeks might hold one another in slavery, but captive Greeks might not be sold to barbarians.

There was a deeper apprehension of sin in the post-Homeric era. Sin was conceived of, not only as an infraction of the moral order, but as a rebellion against the gods,—as practical atheism, or ungodliness. Nor do the gods any longer tempt the innocent to sin. It is only those who have sinned whom they entice onward to the commission of further iniquities, by which their retribution is rendered more severe. This agency of the deities, by which sin is made itself a divine judgment, and the transgressor is made to wade deeper and deeper in the mire of guilt and suffering, is quite prominent in the post-Homeric writers.

4. That human life is replete with trouble and sorrow continues to be the subject of plaintive remark. It is an undertone in the literature of the most brilliant period of Grecian history. The chorus in Œdipus Tyrannus thus exclaims :—

> "Ah, race of mortal men,
> How as a thing of naught
> I count ye, though ye live;
> For who is there of men
> That more of blessing knows,
> Than just a little while
> To seem to prosper well,
> And, having seemed, to fall?" [1]

Ajax, in his wretchedness, looking on his child, says:

[1] *ἰὼ γενεαὶ βροτῶν,*
ὡς ὑμᾶς ἴσα καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ζῶσας ἐναριθμῶ.
τίς γὰρ, τίς ἀνὴρ πλέον
τᾶς εὐδαιμονίας φέρει
ἢ τοσοῦτον δσον δοκεῖν
καὶ δόξαντ' ἀποκλῖναι?—Œd. Rex, 1186–1192.

—"Sweetest life is found
In those unconscious years ere yet thou know
Or joy or sorrow."[1]

Pindar sings:—

"But o'er men's hearts unnumbered errors hang;
Nor can dim Reason's glimmering show
The flowery path untrod by woe,
Or find the day's delight, that brings no sorrow's pang."[2]

And again:—

"'Tis not given for man to know
When pale death shall strike the blow,
Nor e'en if one serener day,
The sun's brief child, shall pass away
Unclouded as it rose. The waves
Of life with ceaseless changes flow,
And, as the tempest sleeps or raves,
Bring triumph or disaster, weal or woe."[3]

That "no man is to be thought happy until after his death" was one of the most familiar of proverbs, to illustrate the mutable lot of humanity.

Hades continued to be a region of gloom. It came to be considered a scene of trial and judgment, and of rewards, as well as of sufferings. The soul was no longer so identified with the body, as in Homer. Yet seldom is any bright

[1] ἐν τῷ φρονεῖν γὰρ μηδὲν ἡδιστος βίος,
ἕως τὸ χαίρειν καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι μάθῃς.
Ajax, 554–555.

[2] —ἦτοι βροτῶν γε κέκριται
πεῖρας ὃν τι θανάτου,
οὐδ' ἀσύχιμον ἀμέραν ὀπότε, παῖδ' ἀλίου,
ἀτειρεῖ σὺν ἀγαθᾷ τελευτάσομεν· ῥοαὶ δ'ἄλλοτ' ἄλλαί,
εὐθυμιᾶν τε μετὰ καὶ πόνων ἐς ἀνδρες ἔβαν.
Olymp. ii. Ant. ii.

[3] —ἀμφὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων φασὶν ἀμπλακίαι
ἀναρίθμητοι κρέμανται· τοῦτο δ'ἀμάχανον εὑρεῖν,
ὅτι νῦν ἐν καὶ τελευτᾷ φέρτατον ἀνδρὶ τυχεῖν.
Olymp. vii., Str. ii.

anticipation connected with death. The enthusiasm of Œdipus seems to intimate a happy hereafter; yet there we find no definite suggestion of such a prospect.[1] On occasions where we might look for some glowing expression of hope in reference to the departed, as in the funeral oration of Pericles for the fallen patriots, there is an ominous silence.[2] The consciousness of guilt left a sting in death. The Orphic and Eleusinian mysteries were a means of purifying the conscience, and of awakening more joyful hopes for the future. Underlying the former was the Pythagorean tenet of transmigration. The aim was to cleanse the soul from sin and guilt, and thus to give peace to the conscience, and a better hope. The Eleusinian ceremonies, acting principally upon the feelings, served to dispel the gloomy dread of the grave, and to infuse a more glad belief and anticipation respecting the destiny of the soul. The hopes thus engendered find expression in Pindar. In passages, which Plutarch cites in the "Consolation to Apollonius,"[3] the Poet describes the abode of the righteous, where there is no night, where grow the fairest blossoms and the most fragrant plants, and trees exhaling the sweetest perfume:

> "Death doth its efforts on the body spend,
> But the aspiring soul doth upward tend.
> Nothing can damp that bright and subtile flame
> Immortal as the Gods from whence it came." [4]

In the second Olympic Ode, the lot of the good, whose souls have thrice stood a trial on earth, and are now in the Happy Isle, among gentle breezes and "blooms of gold," is contrasted with the doom of the bad. In the tragic

[1] Œd at Col., 1611 seq. [2] Thucyd., ii. 35-46. [3] Consol. ad Apoll. xxxv.

[4] σῶμα μὲν πάντων ἔπεται
θανάτῳ περισθενεῖ, ζῶν
δὲ λείπεται αἰῶνος εἴδωλον·
[τὸ] γὰρ μόνον ἐστίν ἐκ θεῶν.

poets, it is only the select few, like Agamemnon, who, being raised in the under world to the rank of heroes, and even invoked, have a blessed lot. But apart from the influence of the mysteries upon the initiated class, and as regards the mass of the people, it is probable that the Homeric notions still prevailed, and were the foundation of the popular beliefs respecting the dead. With the cultivated, with the exception of a select band of philosophers, the desire of posthumous fame took the place of the faith in a future, immortal existence of the soul.

CHAPTER IV.

THE POPULAR RELIGION OF THE GREEKS AND ROMANS AND ITS DECLINE.

It is natural to ask how the Greeks could ever have given credence to the myths which attributed gross immorality to the gods, and at the same time have continued to venerate them. How could men adore, and laud as just and good, beings to whom they imputed deeds of treachery, lust, and cruelty, such as, when done by men, they abhorred? In the history of religion it is often found that incongruous conceptions may abide in the mind without jostling each other. The myths in question might be credited, in an unreflecting age, without prompting to such an induction relative to the general character of the gods, as these stories would logically warrant. These exalted beings might be thought to stand on a different plane as to moral responsibility, and to enjoy a license not the privilege of mortals. Some might be content to leave the crimes and infirmities of the gods in the twilight of mystery, not allowing their general habit of reverence to be disturbed by their inability to solve difficulties. The ambition of the leading families in Greece to trace their descendants to the gods tended to multiply the tales relative to the amours of Jove, and of his Olympian companions. The combination of myths having a separate origin—the identification of deities having different names—had the same effect. Not an impure fancy chiefly, but circumstances attending the

growth of mythology in the form in which it was cast by the poets, had led to the creation of these offensive stories.[1] One main key to the solution of the problem just presented lies in the peculiar anthropomorphic idea of the government exercised by the dwellers upon Olympus. It was fashioned after the analogy of city governments so familiar to Greek experience. One civil administration might subvert another; individuals clothed with authority might occasionally abuse their power, and avail themselves of their extraordinary opportunities for the gratification of ambition and lust; yet, on the whole, justice was administered, society was protected, government was a blessing, and rulers were to be loyally and reverently supported. Zeus and the members of his great council might wrangle with one another, and the ruling body might be torn by faction, and its members do deeds of fraud and violence; yet, in the main, it was a righteous and wholesome sway which they exercised over men. The time must come, however, and did come, when the myths to which we refer, became repugnant to the moral sense, and men were reluctant to believe such things of their divinities. Then they were rejected as an invention of the poets, or explained away by some device of interpretation. This protest on moral grounds goes back as far as Pindar. He declares that nothing but what is becoming should be related of the heavenly powers.[2] He denounces as blasphemous the story of the cannibal feast spread for the gods by the father of Pelops.[3] Xenophanes also, in the sixth century before Christ, openly attacked on moral grounds the mythical tales of Homer and Hesiod. He also drew attention to the anthropomorphic character of the popular religion, as shown in the fact that the Ethiopians make

[1] Compare K. O. Müller, *Proiegomena*, Engl transl., p. 294.
[2] Ol. Od. i. Str. ii. [3] Ibid. Ep. ii.

the images of their gods black and with flat noses, as the people are themselves; the Thracians, on the other hand, make their gods blue-eyed and red; and in general every nation copies its own physical characteristics. He said that if beasts were to draw a likeness of the gods, the horses would make them like themselves, and so oxen and lions would ascribe their own forms to the divinities. Xenophanes himself asserted the unity of God, according to a Pantheistic conception. Afterwards the philosophers, Socrates and Plato, and their contemporary, the orator Isocrates, deny that anything is true of the gods but what is honorable and worthy, and reject the immoral fables as the product of fiction.

But the entire fabric of mythology, being a creation of the fancy of rude and simple ages, was ill fitted to bear an examination. It must betray its weakness the moment it is exposed to the light of rational inquiry. The expansion of the Greek mind brought with it the spirit of investigation. Natural philosophy had another explanation to give for physical phenomena than that of the incessant interference of a crowd of personal divinities. Historical study dissolved many a sacred legend, taught men to call for proofs where no proofs could be forthcoming, and tended to inspire a general temper of distrust in regard to the popular creed. As civilization advanced, and men in large numbers were trained to use their reason in the complex affairs of peace and war, the weak places in the traditional faith must become more and more exposed to view.[1] Allegory was a natural method of treating what could not safely be made the object of a direct assault. Anaxagoras pronounced the several deities to be symbols of physical forces, and thus converted the whole mythology into a

[1] For a description of this intellectual change, see Grote's *Hist. of Greece*, i. ch. xvi.

scheme of natural philosophy. Metrodorus, on the contrary, resolved the popular system into a moral philosophy, by identifying the deities with abstract ethical precepts. These were not isolated individuals, but represented schools, or more general movements, of opinion. Anaxagoras, a man of great ability, asserted that the sun, instead of being alive, as was universally supposed, was a stone, incandescent and larger than the Peloponnesus. The moon, he said, was an earth, with heights and hollows. He denied, also, destiny—εἱμαρμένη—and pronounced it an empty word. He went so far, moreover, as to deny the reality of the signs and omens on which auguries were founded. When Lampon the diviner, predicted from the circumstance that a ram with one horn was found on the farm of Pericles, that his party would triumph over the opposite faction and obtain the government, the philosopher dissected the skull, and showed to the bystanders the natural cause of the phenomenon in the peculiar shape of the animal's brain. It is worth while to observe that Plutarch argues that both the philosopher, and the diviner were right. The divine agency had shaped the brain of the ram that it might serve as a sign of what was to occur. Prosecuted for impiety, Anaxagoras was delivered only by the strenuous exertions of Pericles.[1] Some, as Diagoras of Melos, in the latter part of the 5th century B. C., if the traditions about him are to be accepted, avowed a downright atheism. He is said to have indicated his general tone of feeling by throwing a wooden image of Hercules into the fire to cook a dish of lentils. Then, in the time of Alexander the Great, Euemerus arose, who broached the doctrine that the myths are exaggerations of veritable human history,—natural persons and events, raised by fancy to the height of the supernatural.

[1] Vita Periclis.

Zeus, for example, was once a king of Crete, and a conqueror. It was claimed that his grave had been found. His position and achievements as a god were the result of a poetic transformation. It belonged to historical inquiry to penetrate to the real nucleus at the centre of the mythical and legendary narratives. This naturalistic theory offered a plausible ground for many to stand upon, who shrank from a total rejection of the old traditions.

The dramas of Euripides, in connection with the way in which they were received, afford striking evidence that an era of skepticism was arising which provoked a reactionary hostility on the side of conservative and superstitious feeling. The irreverent and unbelieving utterances which the poet put into the mouths of some of his characters awakened the wrath of his auditors. A certain degree of liberty in this direction must be allowed to a dramatist, and had been exercised here and there by Sophocles, and, though to a less extent—if we except the Prometheus, where there was justification in the peculiarity of the theme, and in the final part of the trilogy—by Æschylus. In Milton's Paradise Lost, or in the "Two Voices" of Tennyson, the poet is not to be charged with all the sentiments uttered in the dialogue. But there was a skeptical tone in Euripides, a betrayal of sympathy on the part of the writer with the obnoxious sentiments expressed by the personages of the drama,—which, coupled with the increased sensitiveness of his audiences, excited their anger and caused them, on one occasion at least, to drown the voice of the actors with their indignant outcries. It was the age of the Sophists, and Euripides had caught the spirit of the time. Whatever merit may have belonged to individuals among the Sophists, however legitimate and useful their vocation as teachers may have been, there is no reason, notwithstanding the defence of them by Mr. Grote, to modify essentially

the verdict of the best of their contemporaries concerning their character and influence. Their method fostered a skepticism which tended not only to undermine the mythological system, but to subvert generally the foundations of religious truth. The maxim of Protagoras that man, meaning each individual, is the measure of all things, was an assertion of the relativity of knowledge, which strikes at the root of objective reality.[1] The cleverness and logical dexterity which their training was directed to produce, in the absence of a proportionate development of moral feeling, was unfavorable to positive convictions of any sort. The philosophical service of the Sophists was of a negative and destructive sort.[2] They pulled down, but could not build up. Hence their existence is an indication of the change which was passing over the Greek mind, and which their influence helped to accelerate.

The influence of historical curiosity, and the growth of a historical sense, in overturning the popular faith, were potent. This effect appears, in a certain degree, in Herodotus, who, with all his natural devoutness and credulity, is driven by his own reflection to subtract something from the legends; for instance, to reject the story of the miraculous labors of Hercules. In one remarkable passage Herodotus asserts, on the ground of what he had learned at Dodona, that the ancient Pelasgi, the ancestors of the Greeks, had given no distinct names or appellations to the gods, but had prayed to them collectively. Their names, the historian erroneously thought, came from Egypt. But as for the special epithets attached to them, and the func-

[1] Diog. L. ix. 51. (Ritter and Preller, *Hist. Phil.*, p. 132.) The maxim of Protagoras is confuted by Plato, in the *Theætetus*.

[2] For an impartial estimate of the influence of the Sophists upon Philosophy, see Zeller, *Phil. d. Griechen*, i. 244, seq. The views of Mr. Grote are confuted by Prof. Blackie in his *Horæ Hellenicæ*, p. 197, seq.

tions or occupations severally attributed to them—all this, he says, goes no further back than Homer or Hesiod.[1] Yet the comparatively recent date of this change appears not to have affected the credence which Herodotus gave to the body of the Homeric and Hesiodic system. In Thucydides, the historical feeling is much more apparent. Grecian antiquity is dealt with in a calm, judicial tone, which, whatever may be said of the particular results arrived at, is in marked contrast with the unquestioning credulity of a former day. There is a characteristic remark of this great historian, which follows his interesting account of the plague at Athens. There had been an ancient prediction, so the old men said, that two heavy judgments would come at once; a Doric war without, and a pestilence within, the walls. There had been a dispute whether the correct reading of the prophecy was *λοιμός*, a plague, or *λιμός*, a famine. The people concluded that *λοιμός*—a plague—was the right word; "but, in my judgment," says Thucydides, "should they ever again be engaged in a Doric war, and a famine happen at the same time, they will have recourse with equal probability to the other interpretation."[2] Thucydides records without comment the alarm occasioned in the army of Nikias by an eclipse of the moon, and the consequent delay of the commander, acting under the ad-

[1] Οὗτοι [Hesiod and Homer] *δέ εἰσι οἱ ποιήσαντες θεογονίην Ἕλλησι, καὶ τοῖσι θεοῖσι τὰς ἐπωνυμίας δόντες, καὶ τιμάς τε καὶ τέχνας διελόντες καὶ εἴδεα αὐτῶν σημήναντες.*—Lib. ii. 53. Grote regards Herodotus as here "recognizing Homer and Hesiod as the prime authors of Grecian belief respecting the names and generations, the attributes and agency, the forms and worship, of the gods." *Hist. of Greece*, i. 483. Blakesley (*Herodotus*, i. 207, n. 153) considers this a too sweeping judgment on the part of Grote, and would make Herodotus ascribe to the Poets the work of "giving a symmetry and consolidation to the popular creed and clothing it in the language of poetry."

[2] *ἦν δέ γε οἶμαι ποτὲ ἄλλος πόλεμος καταλάβῃ Δωρικὸς τοῦδε ὕστερος καὶ ξυμβῇ γενέσθαι λιμόν, κατὰ τὸ εἰκὸς οὕτως φέσονται.*—Hist., ii. 54.

vice of soothsayers, to withdraw his forces—a delay which contributed to their destruction. The silence of the historian must be taken as equivalent to an explicit condemnation. The remarks of Plutarch, in his life of Nikias, on this event, are worthy of note. Before that time, he says, common people had learned that an eclipse of the sun is occasioned by an interposition of the moon. Anaxagoras had explained the cause of an eclipse of the moon, also; but his book was kept concealed, and was in the hands of but few. Hence, the fright of the Athenian army which looked upon such an occurrence as the prognostic of great calamities. "The world," says Plutarch, "could not bear that naturalists and meteor-mongers, as they were then styled, should seem to restrain the divine power by explaining away its agency into the operation of irrational causes and senseless forces acting by necessity, without anything of Providence, or a free agent.[1] For such attempts Protagoras was banished; and Pericles, with much ado, procured the release of Anaxagoras, when he was thrown into prison. Nay, Socrates, who never meddled with any of these points, was, however, put to death upon the charge of philosophizing." Plutarch, himself a devout heathen of the first century, was much too enlightened not to perceive the superstition of Nikias and his troops, as they had too much knowledge to be disturbed by an eclipse of the *sun*, which would have terrified their predecessors. Plutarch here lets fall a word which gives the real occasion of the death of Socrates. He abjured physical studies and speculations; he was a believer in the gods; he even adduced the doctrine of Anaxagoras about the sun as a proof of the vain and profitless character of such inquiries;[2] but his habit

[1] οὐ γὰρ ἠνείχοντο τοὺς φυσικοὺς καὶ μετεωρολέσχας τότε καλουμένους, etc. —xxiii. 16.

[2] Xenophon, *Mem.*, iv. 7.

of subjecting moral and political doctrine to the scrutiny of reason, and his logical fencing, savored of rationalism, and offended the populace. Aristophanes classified him with the Sophists; he was condemned as one of the corrupters of youth. Comedy took the side of conservatives, against the disintegrating tendency developed among intellectual men. But the Comedy itself, by the ridiculous aspect in which it exhibited the divinities, not to speak of its other characteristics, injured the cause which it pretended at first to serve.

Thucydides makes it clear that the Peloponnesian war had a fatal influence upon the national religion. The bonds of morality were relaxed. The obligation of an oath, the sanctity of which had ever been held in the highest reverence, was no longer regarded, when self-interest prompted its violation. The religion of Greece fell with its liberty, and shared in its political ruin. "For the Greek religion," says Curtius, "was not a supersensuous religion, reaching beyond the bounds of space and time, and inspiring hopes of a world hereafter; but it was interwoven in the closest way with actually existing conditions and circumstances; it was a national and a state religion, and its maintenance was the condition as well as the guaranty of the public weal. The national gods were so incorporated with the states in which they were worshipped, that they were held accountable for the commonwealth, and, therefore, the confidence in them was gone, when the commonwealth entrusted to their care was seen to fall."[1] The terrible failure of the Sicilian expedition under Nikias led to a contempt for prophecy, which in this case had been falsified, and for the religious strictness which had led to defeat. Democracy produced an impatience of all authority. Foreign divinities were brought in, and a struggle

[1] History of Greece, iii. 56.

of superstition and unbelief arose, like that which attended the decadence of the religion of Rome. Thenceforward, cultivated men resorted to philosophical discussion as a source of amusement and solace, while the common herd adhered to the ancient rites and forms, from which the life and spirit, and most of the power they had possessed to curb the passions, and to soothe and elevate the soul, had fled.

The Romans and the Greeks were descended from a common stock. The rudiments of their religion, like the foundations of their language, therefore, had been the same. Thus, in common with all the branches of the Indo-Germanic family, the progenitors of both peoples worshipped a god of the effulgent heavens, the Shining One, who thunders in the sky—Zeus, or Jupiter. But as the Romans differed from the Greeks, so their religious development was essentially diverse. The Greeks were quick, versatile, imaginative. Their senses and feelings were alive to the impressions of nature in its manifold forms. The Romans lacked imagination, and æsthetic power; but they had a sobriety, a dignity, and a moral sense, which we miss in the Hellenic character. The Greeks, moreover, were so placed, geographically, that their mental tendencies were stimulated by a maritime life, and by contact with the peoples inhabiting the neighboring islands, and the mainland of Asia and Egypt. How much their religion owed to Semitic, and other oriental influences, is a point not yet determined. The Romans, cut off from the marvels and adventures of the sea, and shut up to a simple agricultural life, gave to their religion no such poetic expansion as that which we find among the Greeks. In fact, they had no national epos. Heroic figures like Hercules, Ulysses and Æneas, are borrowed from the Greeks.

The Roman divinities were of different sexes, but were commonly childless. There existed only the elements of a cosmogony and theogony. The Romans were always great formalists. Their worship consisted in the punctilious observance of a carefully defined ritual. Their deities have not that concreteness, that vivid personality, which belongs to the gods of Greece. There was a class of beings—as Genii, Lares, Manes, Penates—who did not of themselves possess the distinct character of persons, but acquired it only as they were identified with individuals, nations, cities, and localities, or with definite functions and occupations of men.[1] The term *numen*, so frequently used to denote the exertion of power by a divinity, has a characteristic vagueness. At the dedication of temples, and on occasions of public calamity—for instance, when an earthquake occurred—the Romans either invoked the gods in common, or attached a proviso which rendered their supplications applicable to any god or goddess who might be concerned in the event.

At first the number of gods whom the Romans adored was small. But three causes conspired to multiply this number to an almost indefinite extent.[2] The first was the old custom of evocation, or the habit of inviting the divinities who protected the cities which they were besieging, to abandon them, and take up their abode at Rome, whither their worship was transplanted. To avoid a similar act on the part of their enemies, the Romans in early times kept the names of their own gods secret. Secondly, the qualities originally ascribed to their divinities were expressed in the substantive, instead of the adjective form; and this gave rise to a throng of deities extremely abstract in their character,—such as Æquitas, Clementia, Salus, Voluptas. Thirdly, the appellations of the gods were in part the same

[1] See Preller, *Röm. Mythologie*, p. 45.

[2] See Becker and Marquardt, *Röm. Alt.*, Th. iv. p. 21 seq.

among the Romans and the Italians, while the rites of worship were often dissimilar. Hence, when the Italian divinities were transported to Rome, this difference in the modes of worship led to an entire departure from the original notion of the divinity. Thus Juno was worshipped very diversely in the various Italian towns; and at Rome she was worshipped under different appellations and forms of ritual. The Roman religion, both as to the objects of religious homage, and the ceremonies and institutions of the system, underwent a vast expansion, in comparison with the primitive time when the deities were few, and were worshipped without the use of images. Yet the abstract character of the Roman gods, each fulfilling a certain function, makes their religion less distantly removed from monotheism, or monism, in the pantheistic or theistic form, than that of the Greeks.

But the Greek religion had been undergoing, for several centuries before Christ, an amalgamation with the Roman. Rome was early brought into intercourse with the old Greek cities of Southern Italy, which at length were incorporated under her rule. In the time of the Tarquins, the Sibylline books, which explained the rites proper to be practised in exigencies not provided for by the ordinary ritual, were introduced from Cumæ. Also, the worship of Apollo was brought from this oldest of the Greek settlements, and acquired a constantly increasing influence until at length this Greek god, whose healing power was supposed to go forth upon the body and the spirit, received honors second only to those paid to Jupiter. In early times, the Romans had resorted to the oracle at Delphi for counsel; and after the capture of Veii, they sent there a votive offering. Recognizing the Greeks as kinsmen, and identifying the Hellenic divinities with their own, they incorporated into their creed the myths and legends of the Greek my-

thology, and, more and more, elements of the cultus associated with them. This fusion went on at a rapid pace in the two or three centuries that immediately preceded the Christian era. To make the matter worse, it was only the shell of the old Greek religion that the Romans received. Losing their own religion, they received nothing real in exchange for it. The hollow, unbelieving spirit of the last age of the Republic was a verification of Cato's prediction, that when that race gave Rome its letters, it would corrupt all things.[1] Other causes conspired to undermine and degrade the Roman religion. The triumph of the Plebeians broke up the theocratical and patriarchal spirit that had prevailed in the community of Romans and Sabines which had grown up on the banks of the Tiber. Religion, like the state, imbibed a secular, worldly spirit. The decay and fall of the Roman religion date from the second Punic war; for up to this time the Hellenizing influence had been kept within bounds, and the simple, austere type of the national cultus had not been given up. From this time, foreign rites, which had been repugnant to the feelings of former generations, pushed into Italy and Rome, in spite of the resistance of the better class of citizens. The cultivated class, having caught the skeptical spirit from the Greeks, came at last to the point of regarding the established religion as a necessary part of the civil constitution, as indispensable and valuable for the vulgar, but as entitled to no credence. Ennius, who was born 239 B. C., to whom the Romans looked up as the father of their literature, made his countrymen acquainted with the theory of Euemerus; and this gained many adherents. The Roman literature, from the start, was the virtual ally of the skeptical tendency. The introduction of the Greek stage gave a finishing stroke to the separation of the liter-

[1] See Becker and Marquardt, p. 80.

ary and enlightened class from the popular creed. The representations in the theatre presented the old mythology in the characteristic features which rendered it absurd and incredible in the eyes of thinking men. The priests, instead of being chosen by their own body, were elected by the people. The spiritual offices became entirely secularized. They were filled by wealthy and ambitious citizens, who went through the prescribed ceremonies, as a matter of official routine, with an outward decorum, but without the smallest degree of faith or sincerity. The two main causes of the downfall of the old Roman faith were, first, the influence of the skeptical speculations of the Greeks, and, secondly, the political changes which robbed ecclesiastical personages of all the sanctity which had previously attached to them.

The deification of the Emperors was a suitable climax to the progressive degradation of the religion of Rome. In oriental countries, kings had received divine honors, under the idea, proper to despotism, that their power emanates directly from heaven. The hero-worship with which the Greeks and Romans were familiar, the belief in demons, an order of divinities concerned directly with the world, and the old Roman notion of genii, representatives of the gods, intermediate beings, exercising a divine guardianship and protection on earth, prepared the minds of men for this last act of servility, the apotheosis of their earthly rulers. Just as every individual was thought to have his genius who attended him invisibly from his birth through life, so there was a Genius Publicus—the guardian of the State—whose statue stood in the forum. Religious honors had been paid to genii; especially were there ceremonies of this kind on the birth-days of friends, or of individuals held in honor. Homage rendered to the genius of the Emperor was, therefore, natural to the Romans. It was a

short step to identify the genius with the Emperor's own person. Augustus, and the Emperors after him, at their death were consecrated—canonized, as it were—or raised to the rank of immortals who were entitled to divine honors. By a vote of the Senate, followed by solemn ceremonies, they were enthroned among the gods. An eagle, let loose from the funeral pile, and flying upward, symbolized the ascent of the deceased to the skies. A Senator who swore that he saw Augustus, on the occasion of his consecration, mount to heaven, just as Romulus was supposed to have ascended, was rewarded by Livia with a gift of money. Divine honors began to be rendered to Julius Cæsar during his life-time. His birth-day and his victories were commemorated with religious services, a month was named for him, his bust was worshipped in the temple. After his death, sacrifices were offered up to him upon the altar. He was made a god, and went by the name of Divus Julius. The same kind of adulation was paid in larger measure to Augustus. A multitude of altars and temples arose in his honor in all parts of the Roman world. Especially in Greece and in the East, where the spirit of sycophancy was most rife, did the new cultus spread. Other members of the imperial family, women as well as men, received a like deification. The basest tyrants, like Nero and Commodus, were enthroned as objects of religious worship. To this depth of degradation the Roman religion had sunk. The worship of savage human tyrants was required by law. This was in keeping with the spirit which prompted the Senate, as Tacitus bitterly narrates, to decree offerings at the temples on account of brutal murders perpetrated by the orders of Nero.[1]

A deep sense of justice and of the obligations of law, was native to the Roman mind. Hence there had been a

[1] Ann. xiv. 64.

solemn faith in a moral government of the world. The Trojans in Virgil gave utterance to the sound Roman feeling, when they enforced their appeal for hospitality with the words :—

> "Si genus humanum, et mortalia temnitis arma,
> At sperate deos memores fandi atque nefandi."
> Æn. i. 542-544. [1]

The punishment of evil-doers was sure, whatever might be true of the rewards of the virtuous. These, the Greeks too had felt, were less certain than the penalties of wrong. Tacitus goes so far as to consider it proved by experience that the gods are not concerned about the protection of the innocent, but only about the punishment of the guilty.[2] The power of conscience is manifested in numerous examples ; as in what the same historian says of the anguish of Tiberius.[3] "We talk," says Cicero, "as if all the miseries of man were comprehended in death, pain of body, sorrow of mind, or judicial punishment ; which I grant are calamitous accidents that have befallen many good men ; but the sting of conscience, the remorse of guilt, is in itself the greatest evil, even exclusive of the external punishments that attend it." [4] But Cicero expressed the fear that the loss of religious faith would so weaken conscience as to sap the foundations of ethical justice between man and man.[5]

The Roman statesmen and scholars, in the age when

[1] "But if menfolk and wars of men, ye wholly set at naught,
Yet deem the Gods have memory still of good and evil wrought."

[2] Hist. i. 4. 3. [3] Ann. vi. 6.

[4] Morte, aut dolore corporis, aut luctu animi, aut offensione judicii, hominum miserias ponderamus ; quæ fateor humana esse, et multis bonis viris accidisse: scœleris est pœna tristis, et præter eos eventus qui sequntur, per se ipsa maxima est.—De Legibus, ii. 18.

[5] Atque haud scio an, pietate adversus Deos sublata, fides etiam, et societas humani generis, et una excellentissima virtus, justitia, tollatur. —De Nat. Deorum, i. 2.

Christianity was introduced, looked on the popular religion as a political necessity, and defended, as well as practiced, the "pious fraud" in dealing with the multitude on this subject. Varro, a contemporary and intimate friend of Cicero, and called by him the most acute and learned of men, in his great work, the *Antiquities*, entered very fully into the history and description of the Roman religion. Augustine, who re-echoes the laudation which Cicero bestows on his erudition and acuteness, gives an account of his book, with copious extracts.[1] Varro distinguished three kinds of religion, "*mythical*, which the poets chiefly use; *physical*, which the philosophers use; and *civil*, which peoples use." He did not scruple to comment on the unworthy and absurd character of myths and legends of the popular faith. He went as far as he could; Augustine says, as far as "he dared," in this direction. The second kind of theology, the natural philosophy in its various schools, he describes without censure. Whatever sects it may give rise to, it lends no credence to fables. Civil theology is that which the state ordains, the worship which the laws prescribe. This is described by Varro in all its minute ramifications. By this system citizens are to abide. Yet, as Augustine shows, the contents of the legal religion are, to a large extent, identical with those of the religion of the theatre, as Varro aptly designates the vulgar faith. Objections that lie against the one are equally valid against the other. Varro himself, in common with many others, believed in one deity, an impersonal spirit immanent in the world, and not separable from it. Scholars like him, Augustine truly observes, set forth, side by side, the fabulous and the civil system of religion. The "former they dared to reject, the latter they dared not; the former they set forth to be cen-

[1] De Civ. Dei, Lib. vii.

sured, the latter they showed to be very like it; not that it might be chosen to be held in preference to the other, but that it might be understood to be worthy of being rejected together with it." Seneca, who was born a century after the birth of Varro, avowed in the plainest terms his contempt for the civil theology. His expressions on this subject we owe also to Augustine, as the work on Superstition, from which they are cited, is not extant.[1] Of the rites appointed by law, Seneca says: "All which things a wise man will observe as being commanded by the laws, but not as being pleasing to the gods." "And what of this, that we unite the gods in marriage, and that not even naturally, for we join brothers and sisters? We marry Bellona to Mars, Venus to Vulcan, Salacia to Neptune, Some of them we leave unmarried, as though there were no match for them, which is surely needless, especially when there are certain unmarried goddesses, as Populonia, or Fulgora, or the goddess Rumina, for whom I am not astonished that suitors have been wanting." To this Seneca adds: "all that ignoble rabble of gods which the superstition of ages has heaped up, we shall adore in such a way as to remember that their worship belongs rather to custom than to reality." The writings of Cicero are fruitful in illustrations of the prevalent skepticism. He twice refers to the witticism of Cato, who said that he did not see how the soothsayers could avoid laughing each other in the face. In Cicero's treatise *de Natura Deorum*, Cotta, who is introduced as one of the interlocutors, an orator and magistrate of eminent standing, distinguishes in himself the character of a philosopher, and that of a priest. He says, that before inquiring into the nature of the gods, it is best to inquire whether there are gods or not; and on this point he says: "It would be dangerous, I believe, to take

[1] De Civ. Dei, Lib. vi.

the negative side before a public auditory (in concione); but it is very safe in a conference of this kind and in this company."[1] In the first of the Tusculan Discussions occurs the dialogue between M., which stands either for Marcus, or Magister, and his Auditor: "M. Tell me, I beseech you, are you afraid of the three-headed Cerberus in the shades below, and the roaring waves of Cocytus, and the passage over Acheron, and Tantalus, expiring with thirst, while the water touches his chin, and Sisyphus

> "Who sweats with arduous toil in vain
> The steepy summit of the mount to gain."

Perhaps, too, you dread the inexorable judges, Minos and Rhadamanthus; before whom neither L. Crassus nor M. Antonius can defend you; and where, since the cause lies before Grecian judges, you will not even be able to employ Demosthenes; but you must plead for yourself before a very great assembly. These things, perhaps, you dread, and, therefore, look on death as an eternal evil. A. Do you take me to be so imbecile as to give credit to such things? M. What? Do you not believe them? A. Not in the least. M. I am sorry to hear that. A. Why, I beg? M. Because I could have been very eloquent in speaking against them."[2] Those who are familiar with

[1] Quæritur primum in ea quæstione, quæ est de natura Deorum, sintne Dei, necne sint. Difficile est negare, credo, si in concione quæratur; sed in hujusmodi sermone et consessu facillimum.—*De Nat. Deorum* i. 22.

[2] M. Dic, quæso, num te illa terrent? Triceps apud inferos Cerberus? Cocyti fremitus? travectio Acherontis?

> 'Mento summam aquam attingens enectus siti,'
> Tantalus, tum illud quod,
> 'Sisiphus versat
> Saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum,'

fortasse etiam inexorabiles judices Minos et Rhadamanthus? apud quos nec te L. Crassus defendet, nec M. Antonius; nec, quoniam apud Græcos judices res agetur, poteris adhibere Demosthenen; tibi ipsi pro te

Sallust may recall the account which he gives of the debate in the Roman Senate on the question how Catiline should be punished. Julius Cæsar opposed the infliction of capital punishment, on the ground that death puts an end to pain, since beyond it there is no room either for anguish or joy.[1] Both Cato and Cicero, in their speeches, refer to the doctrine of future retribution as an opinion held by the ancients, without attempting to defend it.

It must be observed that skepticism frequently did not stop short with the denial of the mythical divinities, and of the fables relating to them. It extended to the foundations of natural religion, the truth of the being of God and of a Providence The sneer of Pilate—what is Truth?—expressed a prevalent feeling of cultivated men, that the attempt to ascertain anything certain on these things is vain—the fit pursuit of visionaries. There were those who mingled with their scorn for the popular credulity the acknowledgment of one God, whom, however, they stripped of personal attributes. It was a sort of materialistic Pantheism. The elder Pliny, whatever may be his defects as a naturalist, and however inferior his work may be to kindred writings of Aristotle, was not only a man of unexampled industry, but also of a vigorous understanding. Near the beginning of his Natural History, he devotes a chapter to the subject of "God." "Whatever God be," he says, "if there be any other God [than the world], and wherever he exists, he is all sense, all sight, all hearing, all life [totus animæ] all mind [totus animi], and all within himself."[2] He asserts the folly of believing in

erit maxima corona causa dicenda. Hæc fortasse metuis, et idcirco mortem censes esse sempiternum malum. VI. A. Adeone me delirare censes, ut ista esse credam? M. An tu hæc non credis? A. Minime vero. M. Male hercule narras. A. Cur, quæso. M. Quia disertus esse possem, si contra ista dicerem. Tuscl. I. v. vi.

[1] Sallust, *B. C.* 50.

[2] Nat. Hist., ii. 5.

gods, who are personified virtues, and vices, and even personified diseases, and in the marriages, quarrels, foibles, and crimes which are ascribed to divinities. The deification of men is the best kind of worship. "But," he proceeds to say, "it is ridiculous to suppose, that the great head of all things, whatever it be, pays any regard to human affairs. Can we believe—or rather can there be any doubt, that it is not polluted by such a disagreeable and complicated office?" It is difficult to determine, he thinks, which opinion, that which admits a divine agency with reference to human affairs, or the utter denial of it, is most advantageous, so multiplied and foolish are the extravagances of superstition. Our skepticism respecting God is increased by the deification of Fortune, who has become the most popular of divinities, "whom every one invokes." "We are so much in the power of chance, that chance itself is considered as a God, and the existence of God becomes doubtful." "There are others," Pliny goes on to observe, "who reject this principle, and assign events to the influence of the stars, and to the laws of our nativity; they suppose that God, once for all, issues His decrees, and never afterwards interferes. This opinion begins to gain ground, and both the learned and unlearned vulgar are falling into it. Hence we have the admonitions of thunder, the warnings of oracles, the predictions of soothsayers, and things too trifling to be mentioned, as sneezing and stumbling with the feet, reckoned among omens. The late Emperor Augustus relates that he put the left shoe on the wrong foot, the day when he was near being assaulted by his soldiers." "Such things as these," concludes Pliny, "so embarrass improvident mortals, that among all of them this alone is certain, that there is nothing more proud or more wretched than man." The lower animals never think about glory, or money, or ambition, and, above all, they never reflect on death.

Skepticism, in the absence of a ruling caste, such as maintains an esoteric system in Oriental countries, could not be confined to officials and educated persons. It must betray its existence, and to some extent communicate itself to other classes, in the stir and ferment of Græco-Roman society. To what extent had the leaven of unbelief thus worked its way downward into the lower ranks of society? This is a question difficult to answer. Undoubtedly there is a striking contrast between the impression made by the literature, which reflects the tone of the cultivated class, and that produced by the sepulchral and votive inscriptions which emanate from all orders of men.[1] If there be the spirit of incredulity in the one, there is, on the whole, in the other, the manifestation of an unquestioning faith. Yet, especially at the close of the Republican era, and prior to the reconstruction of society under the Emperors, skepticism had widely spread. Superstition followed in the wake of infidelity as its natural companion. The void left in the soul by the departure of the old faith was filled by new objects of belief, often more degraded than the old, which rushed in to fill its place. The eagerness of Romans for foreign rites, as the cultus of Isis and Serapis, which was partly due to this cause, prevailed in spite of efforts at legal suppression. Devotional practices and ceremonies, such as the old Romans would have despised, were imported from the East, and came into vogue. Magicians, sorcerers, and necromancers, swarmed in every part of the empire, and drove a lucrative trade. They stood in the path of the first preachers of Christianity, as we see in the book of Acts, and in the early Fathers. At the same time, a consciousness, vague and undefined it might be, that the old religion was gradually losing ground, imparted a fanatical tinge to the struggles that were made

[1] See Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms.*, iii. 423, 424.

to uphold it. It was the bitterness that attends the defence of a sinking cause which is kept from downfall by artificial props.

The mischiefs and extravagances of superstition are depicted by Plutarch, in his famous Essay on this subject. Plutarch, unlike Pliny, was a religious man. By means of his Platonic eclecticism, he could believe in one supreme Deity, and yet find room for gods and demons in the capacity of subordinate agents. The tract, to which we refer, opens by affirming that from our ignorance of divine things there flow out two streams; "whereof the one in harsh and coarse tempers, as in dry and stubborn soils, produces atheism, and the other in the more tender and flexible, as in moist and yielding grounds, produces superstition." Superstition has one disadvantage compared with atheism, that the latter is not attended with any passion or perturbation of mind. Its effect is rather frigidity and indifference. The superstitious man is under the distracting influence of fear, and of a sort of fear that is attended with the dread of everything. It haunts him everywhere, whether he is awake or asleep, on the land or the sea. He flies to the next fortune-teller, or vagrant interpreter of dreams. He cannot use his reason when awake, nor dismiss his fears when asleep. Dreading the divine government as an inexorable and implacable tyranny, he is yet unable to escape from its presence. He quivers at his preservers and benign benefactors. Even at the altars, to which men betake themselves to revive their courage, he is full of trembling. The atheist is blind, or sees amiss, but he is not subject to a frightful passion. He sees not the gods at all, while the superstitious man mistakes "their benignity for terror, their paternal affection for tyranny, their providence for cruelty, and their frank simplicity for savageness and brutality." Afraid of the gods, he still fawns upon them,

and runs after them. He reviles himself as an object of detestation to heaven. "God," says Plutarch, "is the brave man's hope, and not the coward's excuse." Trust in him is inspiration to valor. A man would rather have his existence denied altogether, than to be thought of as vindictive, fickle and unstable. It is the foul and senseless excesses of superstition that breed atheism in the beholders. We should flee from superstition, yet not rashly, "as people run from the incursions of robbers or from fire, and fall into bewildered and untrodden paths full of pits and precipices. For so some, while they would avoid superstition, leap over the golden mean of true piety into the harsh and coarse extreme of atheism." [1]

Plutarch is one of the earliest representatives of that movement which aimed to find a *via media* between superstition and unbelief, and to reconstruct paganism by placing under it a monotheistic, or pantheistic foundation. A believer himself in the unity and personality of God, he explained what was repulsive in the mythological tales by the supposition of inferior demons, to whom much that had been attributed to the superior divinities was ascribed. In the second and third centuries, this general philosophical movement, which aimed at the rescue and elevation of the popular faith, secured many adherents among the educated heathen, and assumed the form of a reaction against the spread of Christianity.

Augustus had undertaken religious reforms as a part of his general scheme for the renovation of society and the restoration of order. His efforts were naturally directed in the main towards the re-establishment of religious observances. If this movement gained little sympathy in that frivolous and skeptical society, there were some, of whom Virgil may stand as an example, of a graver and

[1] De Superstit., 1, 3, 8, 14.

more serious turn, who sincerely desired to infuse a fresh life into the ancient forms. In the second century, the influence of philosophy, which inculcated in some form the divine unity, and the influence due to the introduction of other, especially oriental, objects and methods of worship, conspired to produce in the cultivated classes an idea of the essential identity of the various religions. God was conceived of as one being under various names, and the multitude of divinities below the Supreme were taken as representing the variety of His functions, or as subordinate instruments of His Providence. The old rites were left unaltered, but a new meaning was attached to them. This late revival of Paganism in a philosophical form, accompanied as it often was with a real devoutness, constituted a formidable obstacle to the progress of the Christian faith. At the same time, however, the failure of heathenism under its improved aspect to afford precise and satisfactory solutions to the most important problems, operated to prepare many thoughtful minds for the reception of the Gospel. The change in the apprehension of the old system acted in opposite directions, now as an obstacle, and now as a help, to the religion of Christ.

At no time was it a slight thing to break away from the old religion. To quote the language of Gibbon: "The innumerable deities and rites of polytheism were closely interwoven with every circumstance of business or pleasure, of public or private life; and it seemed impossible to escape the observance of them without, at the same time, renouncing the commerce of mankind, and all the offices and amusements of society."[1] But the spread of skepticism rendered the abandonment of the old system easier. It is possible to exaggerate, and, as we have said before, it is difficult to estimate exactly, the extent of this feeling in the

[1] Ch. xv. (Smith's ed., ii. 166.)

age of Cicero, and in that of Pliny. But this is clear, that the mythological religion had entered upon a process of decay and dissolution, which might, to be sure, be retarded by efforts on the side of conservatism, by ingenious combinations and artificial explanations, but which must eventually run its course. The superstition and unbelief to which we have referred are not indications of disease wholly; they are, likewise, indications of health. Superstition might, it is true, arise from an evil conscience, and unbelief might result from the insensibility engendered by a profligate life. But, as they existed in the Roman world, they sprang, in great part, from the fact that the human mind had outgrown the polytheistic religion which the imagination of former ages had created, and was waiting for something better. Superstition testified to the need of objects of faith, which lies deep in the heart, and which Christianity alone could satisfy. Skepticism arose from the insufficiency of the traditional beliefs to satisfy the craving of the spirit, ever reaching forth for some connection with the supernatural world. Christianity could never be evolved out of this unsatisfied yearning of the soul; but it was a hunger and thirst which prepared many minds to receive with open hands the bread of life.

In bringing to a close the two chapters in which we have considered the religion of the Greeks and Romans, a brief space may be given for an answer to the question: What relation of sympathy or affinity to Christian Revelation can the mythological religion sustain?

1. It was religion. The subjective sentiments which enter into religion, as fear, reverence, gratitude, dependence, adoration, the spirit of prayer and supplication to Deity, were there. These sentiments might lack purity, the object on which they should fasten might be, and was, very defectively conceived; "yet there was worship, in its kind

often very earnest." Plato, in the course of his fervent protest against Atheism, incidentally brings out this fact with impressive force. "I speak," he says, "of those who will not believe the words which they have heard as babes and sucklings from their mothers and nurses, who used them as charms, both in jest and earnest, whom also they have heard and seen offering up sacrifices and prayers—sights and sounds delightful to children—of their parents sacrificing in the most earnest manner on behalf of them and of themselves, and with eager interest talking to the gods, and beseeching them, as though they were firmly convinced of their existence; moreover, they see and hear the genuflexions and prostrations which are made by Hellenes and barbarians to the rising and setting sun and moon, in all the various turns of good and evil fortune, not as if they thought that there were no gods, but as if there were no suspicion of their non-existence."[1] In the light of such a description, who can doubt that an ardent and genuine devotion, for ages long, in the case of a multitude of heathen, entered into their religious services? The myths not unfrequently embodied truth of the most exalted character. A gifted Christian scholar, speaking of the "beautiful and sublime fable in the Theogony, of the espousal by Zeus of Themis, the moral and physical government of the world, by whom he begot the Destinies; and of Eurynome, of whom were born the Charites, "who lend a grace and charm to every form of life," says: "He who does not here recognize religion, genuine, true religion, for him have Moses and the prophets written in vain."[2]

2. There was a seeking after God in the heathen devotions.[3] The subjective sentiments which belong to religion,

[1] Laws, x. 888 (Jowett, iv. 397).

[2] K. O. Müller, *Prolegomena*, etc. (Engl. Transl.), p. 186.

[3] Acts xvii. 27.

could not reach their perfection of development, or meet with satisfaction, until the one object, worthy of them, who might be "ignorantly worshipped," was revealed in his true attributes. There was thus an unfulfilled demand in the religious nature, which impelled the soul of the earnest worshipper on the path towards a goal that was hidden from his sight, prior to the Christian Revelation.

3. The drift towards monotheism, which was due to the necessities of moral and religious feeling, as well as to intellectual progress, is discerned from the Homeric days. If Zeus mingled in human affairs, often displaying weakness and folly, there was another conception of him, as one who dwells in Æther, the father of gods and men, who flashes the lightning from the clouds, governs all, and accomplishes all his will.[1] More and more, as we advance towards the Christian era, the monotheistic tendency grows in strength.

[1] Compare K. O. Müller, p. 186.

CHAPTER V.

THE GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN ITS RELATION TO CHRISTIANITY.

THE Greek Philosophy was a preparation for Christianity in three ways. It dissipated, or tended to dissipate, the superstitions of polytheism; it awakened a sense of need which philosophy of itself failed to meet; and it so educated the intellect and conscience as to render the Gospel apprehensible, and, in many cases, congenial to the mind. It did more than remove obstacles out of the way; its work was positive as well as negative. It originated ideas and habits of thought which had more or less direct affinity with the religion of the Gospel, and which found in this religion their proper counterpart. The prophetic element of the Greek philosophy lay in the glimpses of truth which it could not fully discern, and in the obscure and unconscious pursuit of a good which it could not definitely grasp.

Socrates stands at the beginning of this movement. The preceding philosophy had been predominantly physical. It sought for an explanation of nature. The mystic, Pythagoras, blended with his natural philosophy moral and religious doctrine; but that doctrine, whatever it was, appears to have rested on no scientific basis. Socrates is the founder of moral science; and the whole subsequent course of Greek philosophy is traceable to the impulse which emanated from this sublime man. A parallel has more than once been drawn between Socrates and Jesus himself; nor are there wanting points of resemblance, which readily suggest themselves. More aptly was So-

crates styled by Marsilius Ficinus, the Florentine Platonist of the Renaissance, the John the Baptist for the ancient world. Respecting the relation of Socrates and of his teaching to Christianity, the following points are worthy of notice:—

1. The soul and its moral improvement was the great subject that employed his attention. He turned away from the study of material nature. He could not spare time for such inquiries; they seemed to him unpractical,—which was not so strange a judgment, considering the physical theories that prevailed; and they meddled with a province which it belonged to the gods to regulate. "As for himself," writes his loving disciple, Xenophon, "man, and what related to man, were the only subjects on which he chose to employ himself. To this end, all his inquiries and consideration turned upon what was pious, what impious; what honorable, what base; what just, what unjust; what wisdom, what folly; what courage, what cowardice; what a state or political community," and the like. [1] His great maxim —"know thyself"— called the individual to look within himself in order to become acquainted with his deficiencies, duties, and responsibilities. To probe the conceited and shallow, expose them to themselves, and by that process of interrogation which he called "midwifery," to elicit clear and tenable thinking, was his daily employment. Euthydemus, an ambitious young man, who thought himself fitted for the highest public office, after being examined by Socrates, "withdrew," Xenophon says, "full of confusion and contempt of himself, as beginning to perceive his own insignificance." [2] "Many," Xenophon

[1] *αὐτὸς δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἀν ἀεὶ διελέγετο, σκοπῶν, τί εὐσεβές, τί ἀσεβές· τί καλόν, τί αἰσχρόν· τί δίκαιον, τί ἄδικον· τί σωφροσύνη, τί μανία· τί ἀνδρεία, τί δειλία· τί πόλις, τί πολιτικός· τί ἀρχὴ ἀνθρώπων, τί ἀρχικὸς ἀνθρώπων,* καὶ *περὶ τῶν ἄλλων*, etc.—Mem., I. i. 16.

[2] *Καὶ πάνυ ἀθύμως ἔχων ἀπῆλθε καὶ καταφρονήσας ἑαυτοῦ καὶ νομίσας τῷ ὄντι ἀνδράποδον εἶναι.*—Mem., IV. ii. 39.

adds, "who were once his followers, had forsaken him"[1] for this very reason that he laid bare their self-sufficiency, and their other faults. Who can fail to be reminded of the *μετάνοια*—the self-judgment and reform—which were required at the very first preaching of the Gospel?

2. Socrates asserted the doctrine of Theism, and taught and exemplified the spiritual nature of religion. It is true that he believed in "gods many and lords many." But he believed in one supreme, personal being, to whom the deepest reverence was to be paid. He presents the argument from design for the existence of God, appealing to the structure of the human body, and of the eye in particular, and to the various instances of adaptation in nature, precisely in the manner of Paley and other Christian writers. He argues with Aristodemus to show him the folly, being conscious of reason and intelligence himself, of supposing that there is no intelligence elsewhere. How irrational to disbelieve in the gods, because he cannot see them, when he admits the reality of his own soul, which is invisible![2] In looking at a book of Anaxagoras, Socrates had been struck with pleasure in finding that he admitted a supreme intelligence—*νοῦς*; but he was proportionately disappointed in discovering that nothing was said to be done by this being, except to give the initial motion to matter.[3] He taught the truth of a universal Providence. "He was persuaded," says Xenophon, "that the gods watch over the actions and affairs of men in a way altogether different from what the vulgar imagined; for while these limited their knowledge to some particulars only, Socrates, on the contrary, extended it to all; firmly persuaded that every word, every action, nay, even our

[1] *Πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν οὕτω διατεθέντων ὑπὸ Σωκράτους οὐκέτι αὐτῷ προσήεσαν.*—Ibid., § 40.

[2] Mem., I. iv. 2 seq.

[3] Ibid.

most retired deliberations, are open to their view; that they are everywhere present, and communicate to mankind all such knowledge as relates to the conduct of human life."[1] He had only one prayer, that the gods would give him those things that were good, of which they alone were the competent judges. To ask for gold, silver, or power, was to seek for a doubtful advantage. The poor man's gift was as acceptable to heaven, as the offerings of the wealthy. "The service," he said, "paid to the Deity by the pure and pious soul, is the most grateful sacrifice."[2] Not only as to offerings, but also as to all other things, he had no better advice to give to his friends, than that "they should do all things according to their ability."[3] He counseled absolute obedience to the Deity, and acted on this principle. It was no more possible to induce him to go counter to any intimation from the Deity respecting what should or should not be done, than to make him desert a clear, well-instructed guide for one who is ignorant and blind.[4] He looked with contempt, writes his faithful disciple, upon "all the little arts of human prudence," when placed in comparison with divine counsels and admonitions.[5] He chose his career in compliance with an inward call from God, which he did not feel at liberty to disregard. He abstained from any proposed action when he felt himself checked by a feeling within, which he considered to be the voice of the demon, or

[1] *καὶ γὰρ ἐπιμελεῖσθαι θεοὺς ἐνόμιζεν ἀνθρώπων, οὐχ ὃν τρόπον οἱ πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν. οὗτοι μὲν γὰρ οἴονται τοὺς θεοὺς τὰ μὲν εἰδέναι, τὰ δ' οὐκ εἰδέναι. Σωκράτης δὲ πάντα μὲν ἡγεῖτο θεοὺς εἰδέναι, τά τε λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα καὶ τὰ σιγῇ βουλευόμενα, πανταχοῦ δὲ παρεῖναι, καὶ σημαίνειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων πάντων.*—Mem., I. i. 19.

[2] *Ἀλλ' ἐνόμιζε τοὺς θεοὺς ταῖς παρὰ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων τιμαῖς μάλιστα χαίρειν.*—Mem., I. iii. 3.

[3] Mem., I. iii. 3.

[4] Mem., I. iii. 4.

[5] *Αὐτὸς δὲ πάντα τανθρώπινα ὑπερεώρα πρὸς τὴν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν ξυμβουλίαν.*—Mem., I. iii. 4.

spirit, that attended him. These things belong to the character of Socrates; but, in this case, character and conduct are not to be separated from teaching. His spirit is well shown in the beautiful story of the Choice of Hercules, which he narrates to Aristippus, whom he would persuade to lead a manly and virtuous life.[1] There is reason to think that the "Apology" reports with substantial truth what Socrates said to his judges. After explaining how his plain dealing, in exposing to men their defects, and in unveiling false pretensions, made him many enemies, he says that he lamented this fact; "but," he adds, "necessity was laid upon me,—the word of God, I thought, ought to be considered first."[2] His immovable fidelity to his convictions of right was connected with his profound faith in the moral government of the world, and in the care of God for His servants. "A man"—so he spoke to his judges—"a man who is good for any thing ought not to calculate the chance of living or dying; he ought only to consider whether in doing any thing, he is doing right or wrong—acting the part of a good man, or of a bad."[3] "Be of good cheer about death, and know this of a truth—that no evil can happen to a good man, either in life, or after death. He and his are not neglected by the gods; nor has my own approaching end happened by mere chance. But I see clearly that to die and be released was better for me; and therefore the oracle"—that is, the demon who imparted only negative monitions—"gave no sign."[4]

[1] Mem., II. i.

[2] ὅμως δὲ ἀναγκαῖον ἐδόκει εἶναι τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ πλείστου ποιεῖσθαι. 21 E.—(Jowett, i. 336).

[3] Οὐ καλῶς λέγεις, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, εἰ οἴει δεῖν κίνδυνον ὑπολογίζεσθαι τοῦ ζῆν ἢ τεθνάναι ἀνδρα, ὅτου τι καὶ σμικρὸν ὄφελός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκεῖνο μόνον σκοπεῖν, ὅταν πράττῃ τι, πότερον δίκαια ἢ ἄδικα πράττει, καὶ ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ ἔργα ἢ κακοῦ. 28 B.—(Jowett, i. 343).

[4] Ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμᾶς χρή, ὦ ἀνδρες δικασταί, εὐέλπιδας εἶναι πρὸς τὸν θάνατον,

3. Socrates had a belief, though not a confident belief, in the future life and in the immortality of the soul. In the "Apology," he refrains from any positive, dogmatic utterance on this subject. The fear of death is unwise, "since no one knows whether death," which is apprehended as the greatest evil, "may not be the greatest good."[1] Such a dread implies a conceit of knowledge. He argues that either death is unconsciousness and a state of nothingness, an eternal sleep, or, for the good, a companionship with noble and glorious beings who have gone before us; and that, in either event, it is no evil. The last word in his address is: "The hour of departure has arrived, and we go our ways—I to die, and you to live. Which is better, God only knows."[2] But his last words to his friends were —for on this point we may trust the Phædo—a direction to make an offering for him to the god of healing, which implies an expectation of a blessing in store for him in another state of being.[3]

4. In the ethical doctrine of Socrates, virtue is identified with knowledge, with the discernment of the highest good. This is evident from the reports of Xenophon, as well as from Plato. No action was truly righteous that was not consciously so,—done, not from mechanical

καὶ ἐν τι τοῦτο διανοεῖσθαι ἀληθές, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ κακὸν οὐδὲν οὔτε ζῶντι οὔτε τελευτήσαντι, οὐδὲ ἀμελεῖται ὑπὸ θεῶν τὰ τούτου πράγματα· οὐδὲ τα ἐμὰ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτομάτου γέγονεν, ἀλλά μοι δῆλόν ἐστι τοῦτο, ὅτι ἤδη τεθνάναι καὶ ἀπηλλάχθαι πραγμάτων βέλτιον ἦν μοι. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐμὲ οὐδαμοῦ ἀπέτρεψε τὸ σημεῖον—41 C, D (Jowett, i. 355).

[1] Οἶδε μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς τὸν θάνατον οὐδ' εἰ τυγχάνει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ πάντων μέγιστον ὂν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, δεδίασι δ' ὡς εὖ εἰδότες, ὅτι μέγιστον τῶν κακῶν ἐστι. Apol. 29 A. (Jowett, i. 343).

[2] Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἤδη ὥρα ἀπιέναι, ἐμοὶ μὲν ἀποθανουμένῳ, ὑμῖν δὲ βιωσομένοις. ὁπότεροι δὲ ἡμῶν ἐρχονται ἐπὶ ἄμεινον πρᾶγμα, ἄδηλον παντὶ πλὴν ἢ τῷ θεῷ. 42. (Jowett, i. 316).

[3] Phæd., 118.

habit, but with a perception of its moral quality. Moreover, the perception of virtue could not fail to be attended with the practice of it. None who saw the highest good, would fail to choose it. It is probable that Socrates had in mind a theory like that of Locke who makes the will follow the last dictate of the understanding, or like that of Jonathan Edwards, that the will is as the greatest apparent good. Whatever is preferred is looked upon in the light of a good. Xenophon, in one place, states the doctrine in this way: "Socrates made no distinction between wisdom and a virtuous temper; for he judged that he who so discovered what things are laudable and good, as to choose them, what evil and base, as to avoid them, was both wise and virtuously tempered." [1] Nevertheless, the doctrine of Socrates, which Aristotle, also, attributes to him, would, if logically carried out, resolve virtue into an intellectual state, and subvert the ground of moral accountableness for evil-doing. It is plain that Socrates, notwithstanding counter elements in his teaching, and his practical earnestness, unwittingly laid the foundation of that intellectualism which made the highest spiritual attainments accessible only to the gifted few,—a spirit which pervaded the schools of Greek philosophy afterwards. His aim was a worthy one, to impart to ethics a scientific character; as it was his aim, generally, to rescue objective truth from the skepticism that would convert all verities into subjective notions, or feelings.

Yet Socrates was personally far from disposed to exaggerate the intellectual powers of man, or to overlook the limits of human reason. On the contrary, he was cha-

[1] Σοφίαν δὲ καὶ σωφροσύνην οὐ διώριζεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν τὰ μὲν καλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ γιγνώσκοντα χρῆσθαι αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸν τὰ αἰσχρὰ εἰδότα εὐλαβεῖσθαι, σοφόν τε καὶ σώφρονα ἔκρινεν.—Mem., III. ix. 4. For further illustrative passages see Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.*, i. 85.

racterized by a genuine humility. The Pythian prophetess had called him the wisest of men. He could explain this laudation only by the reflection that he was conscious of his ignorance. After talking with a politician, he said to himself: "He knows nothing, and thinks that he knows. I neither know nor think that I know. In this latter particular, then, I seem to have slightly the advantage of him."[1] After plying others with questions, he was led to the same conclusion. Simmias, in the Phædo, says that one who cannot learn the truth about the great matters connected with the soul and the future life, must take the best of human notions as a raft on which to sail through life, "if he cannot find some word of God which will more surely and safely carry him."[2] This reference to a possible divine revelation is quite in the Socratic spirit.

In passing to Plato, we do not leave Socrates; but it is not possible to draw the line, in the Platonic Dialogues, between the teaching of the master, and the ideas and opinions of the more speculative disciple. The elevated tone of the Platonic system, and its many points of congeniality with Christian truth, have always been recognized in the Church. Men like Origen and Augustine, among the Fathers, were imbued with the Platonic spirit. Not a few, as far back as Justin Martyr and as late as Neander, have found in the pure and lofty teaching of Plato a bridge over which they have passed into the kingdom of Christ. Turn where we will in these immortal productions, we are in the bracing atmosphere of a spiritual philosophy. We touch on some of the most important points which invite comparison with Christian doctrine.

[1] Apol., 21 (Jowett, i. 335).

[2] — *εἰ μή τις δύναιτο ἀσφαλέστερον καὶ ἀκινδυνότερον ἐπὶ βεβαιοτέρου ὀχήματος ἢ λόγου θείου τινὸς διαπορευθῆναι.* Phæd., 85 (Jowett, I. 434).

1. Plato's conception of God approaches but does not attain to that of Christianity. His sense of the mystery that surrounds the divine being is expressed in the Timæus, where he asks: "How can we find out the Father and Maker of all the universe? Or when we have found him, how shall we be able to speak of him to all men?" [1] Plato teaches that God is a Person, a self-conscious intelligence. No other interpretation of his doctrine can be consistently applied to his various utterances on the subject. When, in the Republic, he refers to the idea of the good as "that which imparts truth to the object and knowledge to the subject," [2] he is setting forth the final cause, which is also the moving spring, of divine action, and of human action so far as it is rational. In the Philebus, he speaks of Zeus as possessed of the mind and soul of a king, and affirms that mind rules the universe. [3] It is impossible to doubt his profound earnestness, when, in the tenth book of the Laws, he speaks of the "lost and perverted natures" who have adopted atheism, and describes it as a notion which superficial youth may take up, but which, as men advance in life, they abandon. It is with moral indignation that he comments on this disbelief in the existence of Deity, and on the skepticism which dreams that the gods stand aloof from human affairs, or can be bribed by offerings to withhold the retribution that is due to sin—as if they

[1] *τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν.*—Timæus, 28 (Jowett, ii. 524).

[2] *Τοῦτο τοίνυν τὸ τὴν ἀλήθειαν παρέχον τοῖς γιγνωσκομένοις καὶ τῷ γιγνώσκοντι τὴν δύναμιν ἀποδιδὸν τὴν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέαν φάθι εἶναι.*—VI. 508 (Jowett, ii. 344). The interpretation given above seems to be most consistent with Plato's other teachings. By some the idea of the good is identified absolutely with God. See Butler's *Lectures on Ancient Phil.*, ii. 62, but also Thompson's Note. See, also, Ritter, *Hist. of Anc. Phil.*, ii. 284. For other views of the passage, see Zeller, *Gesch. d. Griech. Phil.*, ii. 208, 309, 310.

[3] Phileb., 30.

were ready to share with a robber his spoils. His doctrine is that an inward affinity between us and the gods leads us to believe in them and honor them.[1] But Plato did not escape from the dualism which clung to Greek as well as to Oriental thinking. Matter is eternal, and is an independent and a partially intractable material. God fashions, He does not create, the world. Then, side by side with the Supreme Being, is the realm of ideas, the patterns and archetypes of whatever comes to be, and which, it is clear not only from Plato himself, but also from the polemical attitude of Aristotle, are conceived of as substantial entities. By thus assigning to the ideas a kind of separate existence, Plato gave room and occasion for the pantheistic turn which his system assumed in the hands of professed Platonists of a later day.

Recognizing the gods of the popular creed, Plato discarded as false and impious the myths which attributed to them infirmities and crimes, and he would banish from the ideal Republic the poets who related these revolting stories. In the beautiful dialogue at the opening of the Phædrus, Socrates, who reclines upon the sloping grass, in the shadow of "a lofty and spreading plane-tree," on the margin of the Ilissus, and with his feet resting in its cool water, explains to his companions his reasons for rejecting the rationalistic solutions of Euemerus.

Of divine Providence, so far as the care of the individual is concerned, it is enough to quote this passage from the Republic, which sounds like Apostolic teaching: "This must be our notion of the just man, that even when he is in poverty, or sickness, or any other seeming misfortune, all things will in the end work together for good to him, in life and death: for the gods have a care of any one whose desire is to become just and to be like God, as far as

[1] Leges, x. 899 (Jowett, iv. 411).

man can attain his likeness, by the pursuit of virtue." [1] This faith in Providence led to the condemnation of suicide. Man has a post assigned him by heaven, and he has no right to desert it on account of any hardship that he suffers. "The gods are our guardians," says Socrates, "and we are a possession of theirs." [2] When one remembers how the opposite doctrine prevailed among the Stoics, one is struck with the deep religious feeling of Plato. But we miss in him, as in the ancient philosophers generally, any conception of the final cause of history, of a goal to which the course of history tends, such as we have in the Christian idea of the kingdom of God on earth; and hence there is wanting a broad and satisfying conception of the Providence of God as related to mankind. Hellenic pride, the Greek feeling of superiority to the barbarian, was one thing which stood in the way of an ampler idea of the plan of God respecting the human race. Plato was not emancipated from this feeling.[3] But, independently of all prejudice, the means of arriving at a larger view were not present on the plane of ancient heathenism. Here was a limitation which Plato could not surmount; but as to the moral government of God, under which the good are rewarded and the evil chastised and punished, both in this world and in the world to come—this is a conviction with which his mind is profoundly impressed. The rewards and punishments which we receive here, he says, are nothing "in comparison with

[1] Οὕτως ἀρα ὑπολῃπτέον περὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἀνδρός, ἐάν τ' ἐν πενίᾳ γίγνηται ἐάν τε ἐν νόσοις ἤ τινι ἄλλῳ τῶν δοκούντων κακῶν, ὡς τούτῳ ταῦτα εἰς ἀγαθόν τι τελευτήσει, ζῶντι ἢ καὶ ἀποθανόντι. οὐ γὰρ δὴ ὑπό γε θεῶν ποτὲ ἀμελεῖται ὃς ἂν προθυμεῖσθαι ἐθέλῃ δίκαιος γίγνεσθαι καὶ ἐπιτηδεύων ἀρετὴν εἰς ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ ὁμοιοῦσθαι θεῷ.—X. 613 (Jowett, ii. 455).

[2] —τὸ θεόν τε εἶναι τὸν ἐπιμελούμενον ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκείνου κτήματα εἶναι. Phæd., 62 (Jowett, i. 406).

[3] Plato's objection to the distinction of Hellenes and Barbarians, in the Politicus (262), is on a logical ground; just as, in the context, he objects to the distinction of men and animals.

those other recompenses which await both the just and the unjust after death.[1]

2. Plato teaches the super-terrestrial properties and destiny of the soul. Man is possessed of a principle of intelligence—*νοῦς*—and is thus in the image of God. In a beautiful passage of the Phædo, the notion is confuted that the soul is a mere harmony of parts or elements, subject to the affections of the body. Rather is it a nature which leads and masters them—"herself a diviner thing than any harmony."[2] The soul is immortal. The inward life is "the true self and concernment of a man."[3] "Let each one of us," says Plato, "leave every other kind of knowledge, and seek and follow one thing only, if peradventure he may be able to learn and find also who there is that can and will teach him to distinguish the life of good and evil, and to choose always and everywhere the better life as far as possible."[4] There are two patterns before men, the one blessed and divine, the other godless and wretched. It is utter folly and infatuation to grow like the last. We are to cling to righteousness at whatever sacrifice. "No man," says Plato, "but an utter fool and coward is afraid of death itself, but he is afraid of doing wrong. For, to go to the world below, having a soul which is like a vessel full of injustice, is the last and worst

[1] *Ταῦτα τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, οὐδέν ἐστι πλήθει οὐδὲ μεγέθει πρὸς ἐκεῖνα ἃ τελευτήσαντα ἑκάτερον περιμένει.*—Rep., x. 614 (Jowett, ii. 456).

[2] Phæd., 94 (Jowett, i. 444).

[3] *—ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν ἐντὸς ὡς ἀληθῶς, περὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ.*—Rep. iv. 443 (Jowett, ii. 274).

[4] *—μάλιστα ἐπιμελητέον ὅπως ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τῶν ἄλλων μαθημάτων ἀμελήσας τούτου τοῦ μαθήματος καὶ ζητητὴς καὶ μαθητὴς ἔσται, ἐάν ποθεν οἷός τ' ᾖ μάθεῖν καὶ ἐξευρεῖν τίς αὐτὸν ποιήσει δυνατὸν καὶ ἐπιστήμονα, βίον καὶ χρηστὸν καὶ πονηρὸν διαγιγνώσκοντα, τὸν βελτίω ἐκ τῶν δυνατῶν αἰεὶ πανταχοῦ αἱρεῖσθαι.*—Rep. x. 618 (Jowett, ii. 461).

of all evils."[1] He goes so far, in a remarkable passage in the Gorgias, as to say that a righteous man, if he has done wrong, will prefer to be punished rather than deprive justice of her due. "The next best thing to a man being just, is that he should become just, and be chastised and punished."[2] No Christian preacher can be more solemn and earnest than Socrates in what he is represented in the Phædo as saying relative to the duty of caring for the spiritual part of our being. "O my friends," he said, "if the soul is really immortal, what care should be taken of her, not only in respect of the portion of time which is called life, but of eternity! And the danger of neglecting her from this point of view does indeed appear to be awful."[3] The soul, it is urged, takes nothing with her into the other world but her nurture and education. The thought is like that of the Apostle—we brought nothing into the world, and take nothing out.[4] No Christian moralist can be more severe in his rebukes of the sensual, who "fatten, and feed and breed," and "fill themselves with that which is not substantial."[5]

3. Plato insists on the need of redemption. In one place he compares the soul, in its present condition, "disfigured by a thousand ills," to the sea-god Glaucus, "whose

[1] *αὐτὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν οὐδεὶς φοβεῖται, ὅστις μὴ παντάπασιν ἀλόγιστός τε καὶ ἀνανδρός ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἀδικεῖν φοβεῖται· πολλῶν γάρ ἀδικημάτων γέμοντα τὴν ψυχὴν εἰς Ἅιδου ἀφικέσθαι πάντων ἔσχατον κακῶν ἐστιν.*—Gorgias, 522 E. (Jowett, iii. 121).

[2] *ἐὰν δέ τις κατά τι κακὸς γίγνηται, κολαστέος ἐστί, καὶ τοῦτο δεύτερον ἀγαθὸν μετὰ τὸ εἶναι δίκαιον, τὸ γίγνεσθαι καὶ κολαζόμενον διδόναι δίκην.*—Gorgias, 527, B. (Jowett, iii. 125).

[3] *Ἀλλὰ τόδε γ', ἔφη, ὦ ἀνδρες, δίκαιον διανοηθῆναι, ὅτι εἴ περ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀθάνατος ἐστιν, ἐπιμελείας δὴ δεῖται οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ χρόνου τούτου μόνον ἐν ᾧ καλοῦμεν τὸ ζῆν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ παντὸς, καὶ ὁ κίνδυνος νῦν δὴ καὶ δόξειεν ἂν δεινὸς εἶναι, εἴ τις αὐτῆς ἀμελήσει.*—Phæd., 107 (Jowett, i. 458).

[4] 1 Tim., vi. 7.

[5] Rep., ix. 586 (Jowett, ii. 426).

original image can hardly be discerned because his natural members are broken off, and crushed, and in many ways damaged by the waves, and incrustations have grown over them of sea-weed, and shells, and stone, so that he is liker to some sea-monster than to his natural form."[1] But Plato's idea of the nature of redemption is faulty from the defect that belongs to his notion of sin. Redemption is not strictly moral, the emancipation of the will from the control of evil, although this element is not ignored; but it is the purification of the soul from the pollution supposed to be inevitable from its connection with matter. The spirit is to be washed from the effect of its abode in the body, its contact with a foreign, antagonistic element that defiles it. And what is the method of redemption? Sin being conceived of as ignorance, as an infatuation of the understanding, deliverance is through instruction, through science. Hence the study of Arithmetic and Geometry is among the remedies prescribed for the disorder of human nature. The intellect is to be corrected in its action. The reliance is predominantly upon teaching. Thus, Plato, through his dualism on the one hand, and the exaggerated part which he gives to the understanding in connection with moral action, on the other, fails to apprehend exactly both the nature of sin, and of salvation.

4. There is a Christian idea at the bottom of Plato's ethical system. Virtue he defines as resemblance to God according to the measure of our ability.[2] To be like God Christianity declares to be the perfection of human character. But there was wanting to the heathen mind, even in its highest flight, that true and full perception of the divine excellence which is requisite for the adequate realization of this ethical maxim. We cannot but wonder at

[1] Rep., x. 612 (Jowett II. 454).

[2] —ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν.—Theæt., 176 A (Jowett, iii. 400).

hearing Plato say, almost by inspiration: "In God is no unrighteousness at all—He is altogether righteous; and there is nothing more like Him than he of us who is most righteous." "To become like Him is to become holy, just, and wise." [1] Yet, with Plato, justice is the crowning virtue, the highest attribute of character. It is Justice which keeps all the powers of the soul in harmony, and connected with this regnant virtue are Wisdom, Courage, and Temperance, corresponding respectively to the several functions, reason, the will with the higher impulses of the spirit, and the appetitive nature. Plato has only an occasional glimpse of the higher principle of Love, which Christianity makes the sum and source of moral excellence; it does not enter as an essential link in his system.[2]

Moreover, the possession of virtue in the highest sense is possible only to the philosopher. And Plato says that the philosophic nature is a plant that rarely grows among men.[3] In the ideal commonwealth, it is only the few who are endowed with philosophic reason. It is their prerogative to rule the many; and it is only the few who are capable of realizing the moral ideal in its perfection. How opposed is this to the Gospel, which offers the heavenly good to all! The idea of an intellectual aristocracy, with respect to which Plato stands on the common level of ancient thought, is made somewhat less repulsive by the duty which is laid upon the philosopher of descending "into the den," [4] and working among men, laboring "to make their ways as far as possible agreeable to the ways of God." [5]

[1] Ibid. (Jowett, iii. 400).

[2] The Symposium, which, though difficult of analysis, contains passages of great beauty, shows how far he went in this direction.

[3] Republic, B. vi. (Jowett, ii. 324).

[4] —*πάλιν καταβαίνειν παρ' ἐκείνους τοὺς δεσμώτας.* Rep. vii. 519 (Jowett, ii. 353).

[5] —*ἕως ἂν ὅτι μάλιστα ἀνθρώπεια ἦθη εἰς ὅσον ἐνδέχεται θεοφιλῆ ποιήσειαν.* *Repub.*, vi. 501 (Jowett, ii. 335).

Plato's Republic offers the finest illustration of the loftiness of his aspirations, and, at the same time, of the barriers which it was impossible for him to overpass. This work gives evidence of the yearning of his mind for a more intimate union and fellowship of men than had hitherto existed. How could this aspiration be realized? The only form of society in which he could conceive it possible for such a community to come into being, was the State. And, in order to give effect to his conception, individuality must be lost in the all-controlling influence and sway of the social whole. Plato says that in the best ordered state there will be a common feeling, such as pervades the parts of the human body; he uses the very figure of St. Paul when he says of Christians that they are members one of another. But this relation could never be produced by any form of political society. Besides this insurmountable difficulty, Plato does not escape from the pride of race. It is an Hellenic state, which he will found, and the Hellenes are not to treat the barbarians as they treat one another, the Hellenic race being "alien and strange to the barbarians." [1] The vision of the Republic must, therefore, stand as an unconscious prophecy of the kingdom of Christ. The ancient heathen world could not supply the conditions demanded for its fulfilment.

Aristotle, when compared with Plato, his great teacher and friend, presents fewer points of similarity to Christian teaching, for the reason that his mind is less religious, and that he confines himself more closely to this mundane sphere, and to the phenomena that fall directly under human observation. Aristotle was a Theist. He undertakes a scientific proof of the existence of a supreme intelligent

[1] —Φημὶ γὰρ τὸ μὲν Ἑλληνικὸν γένος αὑτὸ αὑτῷ οἰκεῖον εἶναι καὶ ξυγγενές, τῷ δὲ βαρβαρικῷ ὀθνειόν τε καὶ ἀλλότριον. Rep., v. 470 (Jowett, ii. 303).

Being, who must be presupposed as the first cause of motion. God is, in His nature, pure energy, not a mere potentiality; He is eternal, immaterial, unchangeable, incapable of motion; He is one being, a pure intelligence, leading a life of serene and blessed contemplation.[1] His conception, though lofty, is defective from a Christian point of view, since God is brought into no constant, living relation to the world, as its Creator and Ruler, and, especially, no place is found for His moral government.

Aristotle holds, likewise, to an immaterial, intelligent principle in man; but he leaves it doubtful whether this element of the soul is invested with individuality, and thus whether our personal life continues after death. Ethics, according to Aristotle, relates to human conduct, and does not concern itself with the end or rule of action which the gods adopt for themselves. He sets forth no general principle like that of Plato, that we are to imitate God as far as possible. And as the highest bond of unity is political, Ethics is treated as a subordinate branch of Politics. But within his own horizon, the perspicacity of this powerful thinker merits the admiration which has generally been bestowed upon it. He discerns and opposes the error of Socrates in confounding virtue with knowledge. He assigns to the voluntary faculty its proper place. If passion were caused by ignorance, he says, then ignorance ought to precede the passion, which is not the case—for example, when a man allows himself to be carried away by anger. Moreover, if sin were merely ignorance, there would be no ground for blame or punishment. As far as men are the authors of their character, they are responsible for the attraction which, in consequence of that character, evil assumes. Our vices are voluntary, and are not the less

[1] Aristotle, *Metaphys.*, B. xii., where the whole doctrine of God is systematically unfolded.

guilty, because they have become, through long indulgence and the power of habit, incurable. Luther attacked the doctrine of Aristotle that a virtuous principle is created by the doing of virtuous acts. The Reformer asserted that such acts presuppose a virtuous principle, and spring from it. It is true that Aristotle is acquainted with no transforming principle which may dictate conduct the reverse of what has existed hitherto; but, as Neander has pointed out, the doctrine of Aristotle as to the effect of moral action holds good when applied to the fortifying of a principle already implanted. One must be good in order to do good; but it is a case where the fountain is deepened by the outflow of its waters.

Passing by the discussion of the particular virtues, where much is said in harmony with Christian morals, we advert to the interesting passage, in the Fourth Book of the Nicomachean Ethics, where Aristotle describes the man of magnanimity, or noble pride. This portraiture of the ideal man contains many features which deserve approval, from a Christian point of view. Yet when such a man is represented as eager to do favors, but as ashamed to receive them, unwilling to stand in a relation of dependence on his fellow-men, and therefore scorning to be the recipient of benefits from them, we have a type of character at variance with the humility and fraternal fellowship which belong to Christian excellence. The character which is depicted by Aristotle in this remarkable passage, is grand in its outlines, but it lacks an essential element, the very leaven of Christian goodness, the spirit of love.

It is evident that Aristotle does not rise above the intellectualism, which excludes the mass of mankind, on account of an alleged incapacity, from access to the highest good. In his treatise on Politics he makes slavery to be of two kinds, one of which springs from violence, and the law of

war, and the other from the inferior mental powers of the enslaved. [1] This last species of servitude he defends, on the ground that the enslaved are not fitted by nature for any higher lot. Some are born to command; others are fitted only to obey. To these last, servitude is a benefit. As reason in the individual is to the lower faculties, and as the soul is to the body, so is the enlightened class in society to those beneath them. The latter perform the part of animated implements, guided and managed by the superior intelligence of their owners. [2] But in his Ethics, when he undertakes to explain the nature and foundation of friendship, he raises the question whether a man can have a slave for a friend, and betrays some perplexity in answering it. As being a mere animated tool, a slave cannot stand in the relation of friend; but, as a man, he may; and as such, may be the object of sincere attachment. [3] In this distinction, Aristotle shows a partial discernment of the incompatibility of slavery with the laws of nature, which, nevertheless, from the ancient point of view, he denied. [4]

At the close of his principal ethical treatise, Aristotle dilates with genuine eloquence on the lofty delight which belongs to intellectual contemplation, wherein man calls into exercise that part of his being in which he resembles the gods, and in this act must, therefore, be most pleasing to them. This is to live conformably to that which is highest in us, which is, to be sure, in bulk small, but in dignity and power is incomparably superior to all things

[1] B. I. 3, seq.

[2] Καὶ ὁ δοῦλος κτῆμά τι ἔμψυχον.—Polit., i. 3. ὁ δὲ δοῦλος μέρος τι τοῦ δεσπότου, οἷον ἔμψυχόν τι τοῦ σώματος κεχωρισμένον δὲ μέρος.—Lib., i. 7.

[3] Ἠι μὲν οὖν δοῦλος, οὐκ ἔστι φιλία πρὸς αὐτὸν, ᾗ δ' ἄνθρωπος· δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναί τι δίκαιον παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ πρὸς πάντα τὸν δυνάμενον κοινωνῆσαι νόμου καὶ συνθήκης· καὶ φιλίας δή, καθ' ὅσον ἄνθρωπος.—Eth. Nic., viii. 22.

[4] With reference to occasional protests, in Antiquity, against slavery, see J. Barthelemy Saint Hilaire, *Politique d'Aristote*, i. ii. § 3 n.

besides. So doing, we, though mortal, put on, as far as may be, immortality. The exaltation of this kind of intellectual activity and joy above gratifications of an earthly sort is most impressively set forth. What Aristotle here describes, with so much depth of feeling, as the highest state of man, was necessarily conceived of, however, as the privilege of only a select few, while Christianity opens the door of access to the highest spiritual good, to all mankind. Nor does Aristotle connect this elevated form of activity, as it exists either in God or men, with a principle of beneficence which is a fountain of blessing, not to the subject alone, but to universal society. On the question whether personal consciousness survives death, the great question of the immortality of the soul, the writings of this Philosopher, as we have said, contain no clear and definite expression of opinion.

From the time of Aristotle, the speculative tendency declined, and Philosophy assumed a practical cast.[1] Its themes were virtue and happiness; its problems related to human life on earth. The later schools, for the most part, borrowed their metaphysics from their predecessors. Religious questions, such as the relation of Divine Providence to human agency, and to the existence of evil, became prominent. The individual was thrown back upon himself, and became an object of consideration, not as a member of the state, but as a man, a member of the human race. The causes of this great philosophical change were various. The fall of the Greek political communities, with the loss of freedom, the conquests of Alexander, and the intercourse of nations, East and West, with each other, the fusion of numerous peoples in the Roman Empire, were events which compelled this intellectual revolution. The old political organizations, in which the life of the individual centred,

[1] See Zeller, *Phil. d. Griechen*, iii. 1 seq.

were broken up. He was driven, almost, to look upon himself in a broader relation, as a citizen of the world. Moreover, the impulse which Socrates gave to ethical inquiry, although it was combined in him with a speculative element, and still more in Plato and Aristotle, continued to be potent, and became prevailing. The Stoic and Epicurean systems, antagonistic to each other as they appear to be, and as, in their particular features, they really are, manifest the same subjective character. Tranquillity and serenity of the inner life is the end and aim of both. Skepticism was the natural sequence of the stagnation of philosophical speculation, after the productive period was over, and of the mutual conflict of the various systems. Skepticism passed, by a natural transition, into eclecticism, which selected from each of the rival systems whatever might accord with individual predilection. Finally, the New Platonism was a form of mysticism affording refuge to the believing but perplexed inquirer.

The two systems which, on account of their influence, we have occasion here to consider, are the Epicurean and the Stoic. We begin with the former.

The theology of Epicurus was a scheme of practical atheism. The adherents of this school did not deny the existence of the gods, but they denied to them any interest, or concern, in the affairs of the world. The current ideas of this philosophy are embodied, with wonderful skill and beauty, in the poem of Lucretius, which has for its subject the Nature of Things. Regarding superstition as the great bane of mankind, he sets out to disabuse the mind of the beliefs that give rise to it. He adopts the atomic theory of Democritus, in accounting for the origin of the world:—

> "For never, doubtless, from result of thought,
> Or natural compact, could primordial seeds
> First harmonize, or move with powers precise;

But ever changing, ever changed and vext
From earliest time, through ever-during space,
From ceaseless repercussion every mode
Of motion, magnitude and shape essayed;
At length the unwieldy mass the form assumed
Of things created." [1]

The same power that began these movements carries them forward. The heavens and the earth, as they had a beginning, approach the epoch of decay and dissolution. The soul is material, and mortal; hence the dread of anything hereafter is needless and vain. All fear of the gods, with which men torment themselves, is irrational, since the gods stand aloof from men, and are absorbed in their own enjoyments. Such is the gloomy creed of the great Poet of the Epicurean sect. The end and aim of existence, according to this school, is pleasure. Socrates had held that man is made for virtue and for happiness, without defining accurately the relation of these two ends of our being. Plato, though not with entire consistency, gives the precedence to virtue, and teaches the doctrine of intuitive morals. Aristotle holds that happiness is the chief good, but distinguishes between higher and lower kinds of happiness. To ascertain what happiness man is made for, we must ascertain the function—the ἔργον—of a being endowed with reason. Virtue is the action which produces the highest happiness, the happiness proper to man; but

[1] "Nam certe neque consilio primordia rerum
Ordine se suo quæque sagaci mente locarunt
Nec quos quæque sagæi mente locarunt
Nec quos quæque darent motus pepigere profecto,
Sed quia multis modis multis mutata per omne
Ex infinito vexantur percitur plagis,
Omne genus motus et coetus experiundo
Tandem devenerunt in talis disposituras,
Qualibus hæc rerum consistit summa creata, *etc.*
Lucr. i. 1021–1028.

then the highest happiness is defined as that which springs from virtue; nor does the Stagyrite extricate himself from this circle. The Epicureans resolved all good into pleasure. All special desires are to be subordinate to the general desire of happiness; and in this notion of happiness, the approbation of conscience is not included. Virtue, therefore, is a self-regarding prudence which so regulates the various propensities and cravings of human nature as to derive the highest pleasure in the aggregate. It is the control of a far-sighted expediency by which unruly instincts are kept in subjection. The founders of this school led virtuous lives, but the doctrine contained no motives of sufficient power to restrain the passions of men generally, and, in the progress of time, showed its real tendencies.

Stoicism existed in two forms; first, the original system of Zeno and Chrysippus, and, secondly, the modified Roman Stoicism of the first and second centuries of the Christian era. If we looked at the metaphysics of Stoicism, we should infer that this philosophy contained little or nothing in harmony with Christianity. It was a revival of the Heraclitic, or Hylozoist, Pantheism. Nothing exists but matter. The soul itself is a corporeal entity. The universe is one, and is governed by one, all-ruling law. Matter and the Deity are identical—the same principle in different aspects. The Deity, that is to say, is the immanent, creative force in matter, which acts ever according to law. This principle, developed in the totality of things, is Zeus. It is Providence, or Destiny. The universal force works blindly, but after the analogy of a rational agency. The world, proceeding by evolution from the primitive fire, eventually returns to its source through a universal conflagration, and the same process is to be renewed in an endless series of cycles. Fate rules all. The world is an

organic unity; considered as a whole, it is perfect. Evil, when looked at in relation to the entire system, is good. The denial of free agency, and of immortality, was a corollary. As to the personality of the minor gods, the old Stoics were vacillating. Now they are spoken of as functions of nature, and now as persons. But if personal, they share the fate of men; they disappear in the final conflagration.

It seems strange that any system of morals worthy of the name could co-exist with these ideas. The truth is, however, that the Stoics did not derive their Ethics from their physical and metaphysical theories, but borrowed these last from the pre-Socratic schools, without setting them in a vital connection with their ethical doctrine. Self-preservation, to be distinguished from the desire of happiness, they hold to be the original, fundamental impulse of all beings. The essential thing is to live according to nature. This is the great maxim of the Stoic Ethics.[1] By "nature" is meant the universal system in which the individual is one link; sometimes, however, the constitution of the individual is denoted; and sometimes the term is used in a more restricted way still, to denote the rational faculty by itself. But to live according to nature is the one supreme, comprehensive duty. Virtue springs from rational self-determination, where reason alone guides the will, and the influence of the affections and emotions is smothered. These are contrary to reason; they interfere with the freedom of the soul. No anger, no pity, no lenity, no indulgence—this was the pure creed of Stoicism. Apathy is the right condition of the soul, which should be moved only by reason. Knowledge is necessary to virtue, since right

[1] —*τέλος ἐστὶ τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν.* Teaching of Cleanthes, ap. Stob., *Ecl.* ii., p. 132 (Ritter and Preller, p. 380, where are the parallel statements of Chrysippus).

doing without rational insight does not fill out the conception of virtue. Hence the virtuous man is the sage, the wise man; every other is a fool. Virtue, too, if it exist at all, must exist as a whole. It is a single principle; and so, too, the vices are united. Hence the world is divided into two classes, the virtuous or wise, and the wicked or foolish.

This stern ideal of primitive Stoicism was softened by the doctrine of preferables. Virtue is the sole thing which is good in itself. But there are external things which are auxiliary to virtue, and these may be called good, in a secondary sense; and so external things which are unfavorable to virtue, may be termed evil. There is, also, a third class of neutral things, not being either advantageous or hurtful in this relation. Thus the Stoics discussed the question whether fame is a preferable. Chrysippus decided in the negative, and so did Marcus Aurelius in one of the most interesting passages of his "Meditations."[1] A class of conditional duties, or middle duties, resulted from the doctrine of preferables. Then the doctrine as to the affections was softened. Their first beginnings were allowed; and certain emotions were admitted to be desirable. So, different grades, or stages in the attainment of virtue, were conceded to exist.

Stoicism was cosmopolitan. It brought in the idea of a citizenship of the world. There is one community, one state, one set of laws. To this one state, all particular states are related, as are the houses in a city to one another. The sage labors that all may recognize themselves as one flock, and dwell together under the common rule of reason. "My nature," says Marcus Aurelius, "is rational and social; and my city and country, so far as I am Antoninus, is Rome; but so far as I am a man, it is the

[1] vi. 16, 18 (Long's Translation, pp. 166, 167).

world."[1] A Stoic, writes Epictetus, "when beaten must love those who beat him, as the father, as the brother, of all."[2] One must give himself up with perfect resignation to the course of the world. There is a rationality and wisdom in it; hence the duty of perfect, uncomplaining submission to things as they occur. All things are divided into two classes, the things that are within our power, and the things that are beyond our power. With regard to everything that falls under the latter category, "Be prepared," says Epictetus, "to say that it is nothing to you."[3] "You must accuse neither God nor man. You must altogether control desire; and you must transfer aversion to such things only as are controllable by will."[4] "That," says M. Aurelius, "is for the good of each thing, which the universal nature brings to each. And it is for its good at the time when nature brings it."[5] "I say then to the universe, that I love as thou lovest."[6]

The Roman Stoicism departed in certain particulars from the rigid system of the founders of the sect. There is a recognition, though not distinct and uniform, of the personality of God, of the reality of the soul as distinct from the body, and of the continuance of personal life after death. In Seneca, the Stoic philosophy appears in a very mitigated form. Self-sufficiency gives way to a sense of weakness and imperfection, which is not far removed from

[1] *ἡ δὲ ἐμὴ φύσις λογικὴ καὶ πολιτική. πόλις καὶ πατρὶς, ὡς μὲν Αντωνίνῳ, μοι ἡ Ρώμη, ὡς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ, ὁ κόσμος.* Meditations, vi. 44 (Long, p. 178).

[2] *—καὶ δαιρόμενον φιλεῖν αὐτοὺς δαίροντας ὡς πατέρα πάντων, ὡς ἀδελφόν.* Discourses, III. xxii. 54 (Carter's translation, Boston Ed., 1866, p. 250).

[3] *—πρόχειρον ἔστω τὸ διότι οὐδὲν πρὸς ἐμέ.* Encheirid. i. (Carter, p. 376).

[4] *οὐ θεῷ ἐγκαλοῦντα, οὐκ ἀνθρώπῳ· δρεξιν ἀραί σε δεῖ παντελῶς, ἐκκλισιν ἐπὶ μόνα μεταθεῖναι τὰ προαιρετικά.* Discourses, III. xxii. 13 (Carter, p. 244).

[5] *Συμφέρει ἑκάστῳ, ὃ φέρει ἑκάστῳ ἡ τῶν ὅλων φύσις. Καὶ τότε συμφέρει, ὅτε ἐκείνη φέρει.* Meditt. x. 20 (Long, p. 259).

[6] *Λέγω οὖν τῷ κόσμῳ ὅτι σοι συνερῶ.* Meditt. x. 21 (Long, p. 259).

Christian feeling. He declares that there is no possibility of a sinless character among men; we are to follow the gods as far as human infirmity will allow. He paints the struggle of the soul, aspiring heavenward, with the flesh which clogs and enchains it.[1] There is a paragraph in his treatise on Clemency, in which he describes the sinfulness of mankind in language which reminds one of the Apostle Paul. He calls upon us to imagine a populous, crowded city, through the streets of which the multitudes are hurrying. What a solitude and desolation would be there, if none were left except those whom a strict judge could acquit of guilt! The judge and the accuser themselves are involved in condemnation. We have all sinned. Not only so, but we shall sin to the end of life.[2] Like Plato, he ascribes the creation to the goodness of God. The first essential of worship is to believe in the gods, and to imitate their excellence. Men are the children of God.[3] The sufferings of good men are the fatherly chastisement inflicted by Him. It is good for men to be afflicted; those who have not experienced adversity are objects of pity. A divine spirit dwells within the soul as a watchman and protector. From God nothing can be concealed. Seneca says that when he retires to his bed at night, he reviews his words and conduct for the entire day.[4] Meditation and self-examination are inculcated

[1] Omne illi cum hac carne gravi certamen est, ne abstrahatur et sidat: nititur illo unde dimissus est: ibi illum æterna requies manet, e confusis crassisque pura et liquida visentem. (ad Marc., xxiv.)

[2] Peccavimus omnes: alii gravia, alii leviora, alii ex destinato, alii forte impulsi, aut aliena nequitia ablati; alii in bonis consiliis parum fortiter stetimus, et innocentiam inviti ac renitentes perdidimus. Nec delinquimus tantum, sed usque ad extremum ævi delinquemus. C. vi.

[3] de Prov. I. Quoniam quidem bonus ipse tempore tantum a Deo differt, discipulus ejus, æmulatorque, et vera progenies. Cf. *de Benef.* ii. 29: Cogita quanta nobis tribuerit parens noster.

[4] de Ira., iii. 36. "Nihil mihi ipse abscondo, nihil transeo."

with all the urgency of a Christian preacher. It is well for each one to have a faithful confidant and counsellor to whom he can unburden the secrets of his heart. "Pray and live," he says, "as if the eye of God were upon you."[1] "Live every day as if it were the last."[2]

The obligation to cherish just and human feelings is frequently asserted by Seneca. "You must live for another," he says, "if you would live for yourself."[3] "Nature," he says, "bids me assist *men;* and whether they be slaves or free, whether of gentle blood or freedmen, whether they enjoy liberty as a right or a friendly gift, what matter? Wherever a *man* is, there is room for doing good."[4] He condemns gladiatorial shows.[5] He says: "live with an inferior, as you would have a superior live with you."[6] He declares that "slaves are our fellow-servants," and are to be kindly treated.[7]

The coincidences between the moral teaching of Seneca and that of the New Testament are numerous and striking.[8] That only a pure mind can comprehend God; that in the intent of the heart guilt lies; that a wise man, when he is buffeted, will imitate Cato, who, when he was smitten on the mouth, refused to avenge himself; that we should be

[1] Sic vive cum hominibus, tanquam Deus videat. Ep. x.

[2] Sic ordinandus est dies omnis, tanquam cogat agmen, et consumet atque expleat vitam. Ep. xii.

[3] Ep. xlviii. Alteri vivas oportet, si vis tibi vivere.

[4] de Vita beata, 24. Hominibus prodesse natura jubet: servi liberine sint, ingenui an libertini, justæ libertatis, an inter amicos datæ, quid refert? ubicumque homo est, ibi beneficio locus est.

[5] Epist., vii.

[6] Sic cum inferiore vivas, quemadmodum tecum superiorem velles vivere. Ep. xlvii.

[7] Servi sunt? immo conservi, si cogitaveris tantumdem in utrosque licere fortunæ. Epist., xlvii.

[8] See Dr. Lightfoot's Essay, *Philippians*, p. 281 seq., where the references are given, and the parallel references to the New Testament.

gentle to enemies; that we should follow the example of the gods who "soften the ground with showers," and do good without the hope of reward; that we should avoid the manners and dress of an ascetic, and do nothing to attract praise; that we should seek after true riches, and invest our good deeds as a treasure buried in the ground; that we should not mark the pimples of others when we are covered with countless ulcers; that we should expect from others what we have done to others; that we should give as we should wish to receive; that good does not grow out of evil, more than a fig from an olive-tree; that hypocrites are miserable and filthy within, though adorned without, like their own walls; that words must be sown like seed, which, though small at first, unfolds its strength and spreads into the largest growth; that it is madness to embark on distant hopes, and to say: "I will buy," "I will build," "I will lend out," "I will demand payment," "I will bear honors;" that the gods are not honored by fat victims, but by the pious and upright intent of the worshipper; that love cannot be mingled with fear; that our life is a pilgrimage in a strange land, and our bodies tabernacles of the soul; that good men toil, they spend and are spent; that the evil man turns all things to evil; that to obey God is liberty; that the whole world is the temple of the immortal gods; that God must be consecrated in the heart of each man; that God is near thee, with thee, within thee; that He should not be framed out of silver and gold,—these are among the sayings of the Roman Philosopher which recall parallel statements in the New Testament.

The personal character of Seneca fell short of his own exalted standard of independence and excellence. But in Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, the noblest principles were exemplified as well as taught. The former excels all other

Stoic writers in the terseness and vigor of his utterances, which often startle the reader from their resemblance to New Testament teaching. The meditations of Marcus Aurelius likewise abound in passages which a Christian believer can read with earnest sympathy. In these writers, Stoicism, while it retains its fundamental ideas, has lost much of its austerity, and breathes a gentler spirit.

The resemblance between certain sentiments in the later Stoics, and passages in the New Testament, has given rise to the suggestion of an influence from one side to the other. The accordance, as regards phraseology as well as thought, is most striking in the case of Seneca. A fictitious correspondence, consisting of fourteen letters, between Paul and the Roman Philosopher, was composed, probably in the fourth century, either for the purpose of recommending Seneca to the esteem of Christians, or of exciting them to a study of his writings. By some, Seneca is thought to have been acquainted with Paul, and to have derived from him, and from other New Testament authors, sentiments and expressions of the kind already quoted. But the earlier writings of Seneca must have antedated the circulation of the Gospels in Rome, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, to which the passage respecting the chastisement of God's children bears the closest resemblance.[1] Some of the sentences which remind us of Christian teaching are drawn by the Roman Stoic from Plato, and other earlier writers. Morover, these choice doctrines, which we have cited, stand in connection with principles at variance with Christian truth, which prove incontestably that Seneca was not a Christian disciple. The phrases which are parallel in form to statements in the New Testament, often have in Seneca an entirely different setting. They rest upon metaphysical and theological dogmas widely diverse from the doctrines

[1] See Lightfoot, p. 289.

of Christianity. We may reasonably assume a familiarity on the part of Paul with Stoic ideas and phrases, since Tarsus was a prominent seat of Stoic teaching. The quotation in Acts xvii. 28, is from the hymn of Cleanthes, and from the Stoic-Poet, Aratus, who was connected with Tarsus. The Stoic description of the Sage, the Apostle applied in a higher and truer sense to the Christian believer. In the believer alone were true liberty, kingship, and the other lofty attributes imputed to the Sage, realized. The ethical terms and conceptions of Stoicism were widely diffused. While it is not impossible, therefore, that Seneca, it may be through intercourse with Christian slaves, had gained some knowledge of the moral teaching of the Gospel, we are not justified in affirming with any confidence that this was the case. [1]

It is worthy of note that there are so few allusions to Christians in the heathen writers of the first and second centuries. There is no mention of them whatever in Plutarch, but one reference to them in Epictetus, and but one in Marcus Aurelius. It is thought by some scholars, however, that Stoicism was affected indirectly by Christian teaching, and caught up from the atmosphere induced by the Gospel, peculiarities most accordant with Christian feeling. It is undeniable that, from the second century onward, there was an amelioration of sentiment, and a corresponding softening of the rigor of laws, on the heathen side. Thus, the laws bearing on domestic relations, on the

[1] The necessity of supposing an acquaintance with Christianity on the part of Seneca, as the solution of the peculiarities in his teaching to which we have referred, is opposed by Baur in his able essay, *Seneca u. Paulus*, in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* i. 1848, and by Denis, *Hist. des Théories et Idées morales dans l'Antiq.* The opposite opinion is advocated by Schmidt, *Essai Hist. sur la Soc. Civile dans le Monde Romain* etc, p. 378, and by Troplong, *De l'Influence du Christianisme sur le Droit Civil des Romains*, p. 77.

prerogatives of husbands, fathers, and masters, became more nearly conformed to Christian ideas. There was, moreover, a general progress of humane feeling. Epictetus condemns slavery as growing out of a higher regard for "the unjust laws of men long dead" than for "the divine laws."[1] Nerva, Trajan, and other Emperors, and subordinate magistrates in cities, provided funds for the sustenance of poor children. Unquestionably, Stoicism had an influence in producing this improved tone of feeling, which is seen in laws and social customs. A learned French writer observes: "The Jurists who flourished after Cicero were in general inspired by Stoicism, which gave them severe and precise rules for the conduct of men to each other. The whole moral and philosophical part of Roman Law, from Labeon that Stoic innovator, to Caius and Ulpian, is drawn from this school, the partiality to which grows from day to day among the choice men who shine forth here and there in the imperial period."[2] Mr. Maine has remarks of a like tenor.[3] The question is, how far this widening of sympathy, which we see in Stoicism, sprang from the indirect effect of Gospel teaching upon the general currents of thought outside of the pale of the Church. That a party may be thus affected by its antagonists is a familiar experience. For example, none will deny that the English Church was materially influenced by the Methodist movement which it so generally opposed. Without denying that an influence of the character described may have reached, to some extent, cultivated men in the Roman Empire, who knew little directly of the Gospel, or knew it only to oppose it, we must guard against attributing too much to such a modifying agency. It is an evident fact that the tendency of political events and of philosophic thought—we might say, of the whole

[1] Diss., i. 13. [2] Troplong, p. 53. [3] Ancient Law, ch. iii.

course of history, had been to engender a more cosmopolitan view, a more catholic sympathy. The early masters of Greek Philosophy, and none more decidedly than Aristotle, had inculcated the obligation of mutual love among citizens of the same community. With the fall of these communities, there came in the Stoic conception of the universal city, coterminous with mankind. As the privileges that belonged to Rome were more and more imparted to the nations subject to her, Rome was conceived of by many as a realization of the universal city, as the common country of the race. We find these conceptions in Roman writers from the time of Cicero; and along with this general notion of a universal state, we find, in theory at least, a wider spirit of humanity. It is not from any Christian influence that Lucan, who died, A. D. 65, calls upon mankind to lay down the weapons of war and to love one another,[1] and that Plutarch affirms that man has his country in whatever part of the earth he may find himself.[2]

The letters of the younger Pliny afford fine illustrations of this more benevolent and refined tone of sentiment.[3] We can account, then, for the elevated, philanthropic expressions of men like Seneca, and for the broader spirit of the Stoic lawyers, by a providential development within the limits of heathenism itself.

When we bring the Stoical Philosophy into comparison with Christianity, we discern some marked characteristics of a general nature which they have in common. First, Stoicism was an eminently practical system. It sought to

[1] Tunc genus humanum positis sibi consulat armis,
Inque vicem gens omnis amet. Phars. i. 60.

[2] de Exil.

[3] See, for example, his Letter on the death of his slaves, to Paternus (viii. 16), or his Letter occasioned by the death of the daughter of Fundanus (v. 16).

determine how men should live, and how they could be prepared to bear trouble, and to die, with composure. Secondly, like Christianity, it exalted inward, or spiritual excellence. All outward things are counted as nothing. The Stoic held power, fame, wealth, even health and life, as possessions to be resigned without a murmur. Independence, inward freedom, was deemed the pearl of great price.[1] And thirdly, there are special injunctions, in which the Stoic teachers approach near to the precepts of the Christian religion.

The differences between Stoicism and the Gospel are equally apparent:—

1. Stoicism makes virtue the ethical end. But Christianity, while giving the first place to holiness, is not indifferent to happiness. Love, the essential principle in Christian morals, is itself a source of joy, and seeks the happiness of its object. The Cynics were the precursors of the Stoics, and the leaven of Cynicism was never wholly expelled from the Stoic teaching. We find when we scrutinize the Stoical idea of virtue that it is practically self-regarding. It is not the good of others, but a subjective serenity, which is really sought for. There is a more benevolent feeling in the later type of Stoicism, but this involves a partial desertion of the characteristics of the school.

2. The Stoic definition of virtue is formal, not material. It gives a certain relation of virtue, but not its contents. What that life is which is conformed to nature, and swayed by reason, is not contained in the definition.

3. We are furnished with no concrete or exact conception of "nature." "Live according to nature," we are told; but no criterion is afforded for distinguishing between the original nature of man, and the corruption resulting from

[1] See the noble chapter of Epictetus, on Freedom, *Diss.* iv. 1.

human perversity and sin. It is remarkable that Seneca acknowledges the need of a moral ideal, a pattern by which we can shape our conduct. He advises us to revolve the examples of good men and heroes, like Cato, in order to draw from them guidance; though he admits their imperfection, and consequent insufficiency for this end. Christianity, alone, supplies this need, by presenting human nature in its purity and perfection, in the person of Christ.

4. Stoicism supposes a possible incompatibility between the welfare of the individual and the course of the world. It implies a discordance in nature, which is in violation of a primary assumption that the system is harmonious. For the Stoics justified suicide. Zeno and Cleanthes destroyed their own lives. Seneca praises Cato for killing himself. "If the house smokes, go out of it," [1] is the laconic mode of advising suicide in case one finds his condition unbearable,—a phrase which we find in Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. There might be situations, it was held, when it is undignified or dishonorable to continue to live. Poverty, chronic illness, or incipient weakness of mind, were deemed a sufficient reason for terminating one's life. It was the means of baffling a tyrant, which nature had given to the weak; as Cassius is made to say:

> —"Life, being weary of these worldly bars,
> Never lacks power to dismiss itself." [2]

Seneca says that a man may choose the mode of his death, as one chooses a ship for a journey, or a house to live in. Life and death are among the *adiaphora*—things indifferent, which may be chosen or rejected according to circumstances.

[1] Καπνὸν πεποίηκεν ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι; ἂν μέτριον, μενῶ· ἂν λίαν πολὺν, ἐξέρχομαι.—Epict., Discourses, I. xxv. 18 (Carter, p. 72). The same simile is frequently used. Compare Seneca, Epp. xvii., xxiv., xxvi.

[2] Shakespeare, *Jul. Cæsar*, Act i. Sc. i.

How contrary is all this to the Christian feeling! The Christian believes in a Providence which makes all things work together for his good, and believes that there are no circumstances in which he is authorized to lay violent hands upon himself. There is no situation in which he cannot live with honor, and with advantage to himself as long as God chooses to continue him in being. Hence, in the Scriptures there is no express prohibition of suicide, and no need of one.

5. Stoicism exhibits no rational ground for the passive virtues, which are so prominent in the Stoic morals. There is no rational end of the cosmos; no grand and worthy consummation towards which the course of the world is tending. Evil is not overruled to subserve a higher good to emerge at the last. There is no inspiring future on which the eye of the sufferer can be fixed. The goal that bounds his vision is the conflagration of all things. Hence there is no basis for reconciliation to sorrow and evil. Christianity, in the doctrine of the kingdom of God, furnishes the element which Stoicism lacked, and provides thus a ground for resignation under all the ills of life, and amid the confusion and wickedness of the world. For the same reason, the character of Christian resignation is different from the Stoic composure. It is submission to a wise and merciful Father, who sees the end from the beginning. Hence, there is no repression of natural emotions, as of grief in case of bereavement; but these are tempered, and prevented from overmastering the spirit, by trust in the Heavenly Father. In the room of an impassible serenity, an apathy secured by stifling natural sensibility, there is the peace which flows from filial confidence.

6. Much less does Stoicism afford a logical foundation for the active virtues. The doctrine of fatalism, if consistently carried out, paralyzes exertion. And how is the

motive for aggressive virtue weakened, when the ultimate result of all effort is annihilation—the destruction of personal life, and the return of the universe to chaos!

7. The cosmopolitan quality of Stoicism was negative. Zeno's idea of a universal community, transcending the barriers imposed by separate nationalities, shows that the ancient order of things failed to satisfy the spirit, aspiring after a wider communion. Seneca says: "We are members of a vast body. Nature made us kin, when she produced us from the same things, and to the same ends." "The world is my country, and the gods its rulers." There is a vast commonwealth, in which are comprised gods and men, and which is coextensive with the world. "Virtue," he says, "is barred to none: she is open to all, she receives all, she invites all, gentlefolk, freedmen, slaves, kings, exiles alike."[1] Sentences like these indicate that the limitations essential to ancient thought, which knew no fellowship broader than that of the state, were broken through. But such a community as Zeno and Seneca dreamed of, did not and could not arise, until the kingdom of Christ was established on earth. Then these obscure aspirations, and grand but impossible visions, became a reality.

8. The predominant motive which the Stoic moralists present for the exercise of forbearance and the kindred virtues, is not love, but rather fealty to an ideal of character, the theory that sin is from ignorance, and is involuntary, which turns resentment into pity, and the consideration that everything is fated, and, in its place, useful. The offender is often regarded with a feeling akin to disdain. The ten reasons which M. Aurelius addresses to himself as motives to forbearance are, that it is nature that orders all things; that men are under compulsion in respect of opinions; that men do wrong involuntarily, and in igno-

[1] De Benef. iii. 18.

rance; that thou, also—addressing himself—doest many things wrong, and art disposed to other faults, but art withheld from timidity or some other unworthy motive; that one must know much in order to pass a correct judgment on another; that, when vexed, one should remember that "man's life is only for a moment, and after a short time we are all laid out dead;"[1] that no wrongful act of another brings shame on thee; that anger and vexation give more pain than the actions that provoke them; that benevolence is invincible, and that evil is overcome by patience and kindness; and that to expect bad men not to do wrong is madness. Among these considerations are some on which the New Testament also insists. The sweeping remark, which is sometimes heard from the pulpit, that the duty of forgiving injuries was not known to the heathen moralists, is not true. The younger Pliny recommends forbearance and forgiveness. Plutarch, in his book on the delay of Providence in punishing the wicked, assigns among the reasons for this course, the desire on the part of God to give room for repentance, and to furnish an example of a forbearing and placable disposition. Clemency is an impulse of human nature as truly as resentment. Christianity introduced no new element into the constitution of the soul. It gave new motives for the exercise of forbearance, and, by its power to conquer selfishness, imparted to the benevolent sentiments a control which had not belonged to them before. It is evident that the false metaphysics of the Stoic school played an important part in producing the temper of forbearance which they inculcated. Sin is ignorance, sin is fated, sin is for the best, anger disturbs the peace of the soul,—these are prominent among the motives for the exercise of forbearance. "If a right choice," says Epictetus,

[1] —ἀκαραῖος ὁ ἀνθρώπειος βίος, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον πάντες ἐξετάθημεν.—L. xi. 18 (Long, p. 281).

"be the only good, and a wrong one the only evil, what further room is there for quarreling, for reviling? About what can it be? About what is nothing to us. Against whom? Against the ignorant, against the unhappy, against those who are deceived in the most important respects."[1]

9. The self-sufficiency of Stoicism stands in direct opposition to Christian humility. The independence of the individual, the power to stand alone as regards men and the gods, is the acme of Stoical attainment. The Stoic felt himself on the level of Zeus, both being subject to fate; and he aimed to find the sources of strength and peace within himself. Christianity, on the contrary, finds the highest good in the complete fellowship of man, sensible of his absolute dependence, with God. The starting-point is humility, a feeling the very reverse of Stoical pride and self-dependence. It is a noteworthy but not inexplicable fact, that while many from the Platonic school, in the first centuries, became Christian disciples, very few Stoics embraced the Gospel. Notwithstanding the many points of resemblance and affinity, there was a radical antagonism between the two systems.

The Greek Philosophy reached the limit of its development in New Platonism, as taught in the first centuries of the Christian era by Plotinus, and his successors, Porphyry and Jamblichus, and by Proclus, the last eminent representative of this school.[2] Skepticism, the consequence of the bewildering conflict of philosophical theories, left no resting-place for minds of a religious turn. Their natural

[1] Εἰ δ' οἷα δεῖ προαίρεσις, τοῦτο μόνον ἀγαθὸν ἐστι, καὶ οἷα μὴ δεῖ, τοῦτο μόνον κακόν· ποῦ ἔτι μάχη; ποῦ λοιδορία; περὶ τίνων; περὶ τῶν οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· πρὸς τίνας; πρὸς τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας, πρὸς τοὺς δυστυχοῦντας, πρὸς τοὺς ἠπατημένους περὶ τῶν μεγίστων. Discourses, IV., v. 32. (Carter, p. 332).

[2] Plotinus was born A. D. 204, and died A. D. 269.

refuge was in mysticism, where feeling and intuition supersede the slow and doubtful processes of the intellect. Plotinus found in Platonism the starting-point and principal materials for his speculations; although the reconciliation of philosophies, and especially of the two masters, Plato and Aristotle, was a prominent part of his effort.

With Plotinus, the absolute Being, the antecedent of all that exists, is impersonal, the ineffible unity, exalted above all vicissitude and change. The idea of a creative activity on the part of God is thus excluded. Emanation, after a Pantheistic conception, would seem to be the method by which the universe originates from the primary being; yet this notion is discarded, since it would imply division in this being, and the imparting of a portion of its contents. Matter is evil, and the original fountain of evil. The human soul finds its purification only in separating itself from the material part with which here it stands in connection. The highest attainment and perfect blessedness lie in the ecstatic condition, in which the soul rises to the intuition and embrace of the Supreme Entity, sinking for the time its own individuality in this rapturous union with the Infinite

While the Platonic idea of resemblance to God, as the life and soul of virtue, is held in form, its practical value is lost by this sacrifice of personality in the object towards which we are to aspire. The civil virtues[1]—wisdom, courage, temperance and justice—are retained; but higher than these are placed the purifying or cathartic virtues, by which the soul emancipates itself from subjection to sense; while the highest achievement is the elevation to God, where the consciousness of personal identity is drowned in the beatific contemplation of the Supreme.

[1] πολιτικαὶ ἀρεταί.

This kind of rapture is possible only to elect spirits, who are qualified by superior endowments for so lofty an ascent. The supercilious tone of the ancient philosophy, the notion of an oligarchy of philosophers, to whom the common herd are subservient, is thus maintained to the full in this final phase of Greek thought. "The life of worthy men," says Plotinus, "tends to the summit and that which is on high." The life which is merely human is two-fold, "the one being mindful of virtue and partaking of a certain good; but the other pertaining to the vile rabble, and to artificers who minister to the necessities of more worthy men."[1] Asceticism was the natural offspring of a system in which all that is corporeal is evil. Superstition, especially in the form of magic and sorcery, was likewise conspicuous in Jamblichus, and in the other later devotees of this school. Christianity holds to a possible illumination of the human mind, and to a blessed communion with God. But this is not a boon open only to a few who are raised intellectually above the rest of mankind. The egoistic absorption of the individual in his own mental states, where the idea of doing good is banished from thought, or supplanted by a contempt for mankind generally, is antagonistic to the spirit of the Gospel. Self-purification is an end which the Christian sets before him; but he pursues it, not in the way of mystic contemplation, but by the daily practice of all the virtues of character.[2]

What were the actual resources of Philosophy? What power had it to assuage grief, and to qualify the soul for the exigencies of life, and to deliver it from the fear of

[1] —τοῖς μὲν σπουδαίοις πρὸς τὸ ἀκρότατον καὶ τὸ ἄνω, τοῖς δὲ ἀνθρωπικωτέροις, διττὸς αὖ ὢν, ὁ μὲν μεμνημένος ἀρετῆς μετίσχει ἀγαθοῦ τινος, ὁ δὲ φαῦλος ὄχλος οἷον χειροτέχνης τῶν πρὸς ἀνάγκην τοῖς ἐπιεικεστέροις.—Enn., ii. 9.

[2] Compare Neander, *Wissenschaftl. Abhandll.*, p. 213.

death? An instructive answer to this inquiry may be gathered from the works of Cicero. Whatever were his faults as a man, in the writings of no Roman of that age does there breathe a more enlightened spirit. The Stoic conception of the universal city is a familiar thought to him. That the individual is to live for mankind, and to restrict his sympathies by no narrower limit, he expressly affirms. Humanity, in the sense of a philanthropic regard for the race, is a word frequently upon his lips. Antitheses like that of Greek and Barbarian, he declares to be contrary to truth and nature. A good man is not even to requite injuries, but to confine himself to the restraint of the aggressor. In his political course, however, and in dealing with ethical questions in the concrete, Cicero too often failed to exemplify these liberal maxims. There is a like failure to realize practically his religious theories. In his work on the Nature of the Gods, and in that on Divination, he shows the folly of polytheism, and of the cultus connected with it. He wishes that it were as easy to discover the truth as to confute error.[1] He is a Theist, preferring to follow Plato in the belief in a personal God, rather than the Stoics in their dogma of the impersonal spirit of nature. He finds in the wonderful order of the world irresistible evidence of the supreme Mind. He sees a corroboration of this faith in the concurrent judgments of men, as evinced in the universal prevalence of religion. Equally strenuous is he in maintaining that the soul is immaterial and immortal.[2] But we have the opportunity of testing the character of his convictions when he is brought into circumstances of keen distress. What was the practical force and value of these opinions? He composed the Tusculan Discussions when he was sixty-two

[1] de Nat. Deorum, i. 32.
[2] E. g. Disp. Tusc. I. xxvii. xxviii.

years of age, after the death of his beloved daughter Tullia. Just after this heavy bereavement, he wrote a treatise on Consolation, for the purpose of alleviating his sorrow,—a treatise which is lost, but the general character of which he describes. The topics of the Tusculan Discussions are the Contempt of Death, on Bearing Pain, on Grief of Mind, on other Perturbations of Mind, on the Sufficiency of Virtue to make a man happy. In the perusal of these writings, we are struck with the distinctness with which the problems of life—the practical necessities of the soul, exposed as it is to affliction, and looking forward to death —are discerned and stated. We are equally impressed with the effort that is put forth to find a ground of rest. Ingenious reflections are brought forward, remedies against grief, which in Christianity are collateral and quite secondary to the main sources of consolation. He says: "There are some who think with Cleanthes that the only duty of a comforter is to prove that what one is lamenting is by no means an evil. Others, as the Peripatetics, prefer saying that the evil is not great. Others, with Epicurus, seek to divert your attention from the evil to good. Some think it sufficient to show that nothing has happened but what you had reason to expect; and this is the practice of the Cyrenaics. But Chrysippus thinks that the main thing in comforting is to remove the opinion from the person who is grieving, that to grieve is his bounden duty. There are others who bring together all these various kinds of consolation, as I have done myself in my book on Consolation; for as my own mind was much disordered, I have attempted in that book to discover every method of cure."[1] "The principal medicine to be applied in consolation is to maintain either that it is no evil at all, or a very inconsiderable one; the

[1] B. ii., §§ 31, 32.

next best to that is to speak of the common condition of life, having a view, if possible, to the state of the person whom you comfort particularly. The third is that it is folly to wear yourself out with grief which can avail nothing." He says in another place: "In order to persuade those to whom any misfortune has happened that they can and ought to bear it, it is very useful to set before them an enumeration of other persons who have borne similar calamities."[1] To be sure, Cicero argues eloquently for the existence of God, and for the immortality of the soul. But when he is himself plunged into affliction, we find that neither he, nor his intimate friends who strive to console him, recur to truths of this nature. There is a striking contrast between the discourses composed for the public eye, and the familiar letters which passed between him and these friends. His correspondence with Servius Sulpicius, after Tullia's death, is an impressive illustration of the small degree of practical power which these religious opinions or speculations had over the minds of such men. The Letter of Condolence which Sulpicius writes to Cicero is marked by refinement and tenderness. He adverts to the fall of the Republic, an event which had filled the cup of grief to the brim, so that no new event could increase the weight of calamity that had fallen on his friend; to the ruins of four renowned Grecian cities, of which Corinth was one, which had met his eyes upon a recent voyage, and which brought to mind disasters compared with which any loss that an individual could suffer is small;[2] to the fact that Tullia had lived to witness her father's public honors and fame; to the circumstance that Cicero, who had sought to console others,

[1] B. iii. 29.

[2] Cœpi egomet mecum sic cogitare: Heus! nos homunculi indignamur, si quis nostrum interiit aut occisus est, quorum vita brevior esse debet; quum uno loco tot oppidorum cadavera projecta jacent?—*Serv. Sulpicius Ciceroni*, F., iv. 5.

would be charged with inconsistency if he himself gave way to sorrow. These are among the prominent thoughts in this remarkable letter. Cicero, in his Reply, dilates upon the peculiar circumstances of aggravation that belonged to his affliction, being deprived, as he was, of the occupation and diversion which arise from official employment, and left without a solace at home.[1] In neither of these letters is there the slightest reference to God, or to a future life. Cicero's treatise on Old Age is another monument of the vain attempt to elevate considerations which, when merely subordinate and auxiliary, have their value, into prime sources of consolation. How current the consolatory reflections were, which are recited by Cicero, in his moral treatises, is evident from their familiar use by other writers. Plutarch, in his Letter of Consolation to Apollonius, who had lost a son, and in his Letter to his own wife after the death of his daughter, a child two years of age, incorporates some of these reflections. As usual, he inveighs against that Stoical apathy which "can never happen to a man without detriment; for as now the body, so soon the very mind would be wild and savage." "A wise and well-educated man," he observes, in the first of these Letters, "must keep his emotions within proper bounds." It is no unusual thing for a man to be afflicted; Socrates was right in saying that if all of our misfortunes were laid in one common heap, most people would be content, instead of taking an equal share, to take their own and depart; the sufferer endures nothing but what is common to him with other men; how irrational to wonder when that perishes which by nature is perishable; we must call to mind the reasons which we have urged to our kinsmen when they were in trouble, and apply them to ourselves—these thoughts have

[1] When in exile, Cicero conceived of his calamities as altogether exceptional.—See *Epistt. ad Atticum*, iii. 10, 15.

a prominent place in Plutarch's Epistle. He intermingles references to the Providence of God which may have ordained for us what is best, and to the possible felicity of another state of being. But the doctrine of the future life, even in Plutarch, is not set forth as a firm conviction, but only as a probability; and he makes an argument in behalf of serenity, on the hypothesis, which is admitted to be not absolutely disproved, that death is the dissipation of our being, and the termination, therefore, of pain as well as of joy. Even outside of the limits of the Stoical school, there was a tendency to make much of natural fortitude and manliness as a means of counteracting sorrow. Plutarch himself says, that when evil comes "one must put on a masculine brave spirit, and so resolve to endure it." [1] Plato says that the principle which inclines us to recollection of our troubles and to lamentation, is "irrational, indolent, and cowardly." We are not, "like children who have had a fall, to be keeping hold of the part struck and wasting time in setting up a howl." Hence the emotional nature must not be indulged. For this reason the dramatic poets must be excluded from the Republic. This poetry "feeds and waters the passions instead of withering and starving them." It evokes pity by showing us the calamities of others, and the result is that when we are afflicted we pity ourselves. [2] The Stoic element which entered into the character of Socrates, an element which is quite discernible in Plato's account of his apology to his judges, crops out occasionally in the Platonic dialogues, though connected with other tenets not consonant with the Stoical system.

In Cicero's time, and in the century that followed, faith in the immortality of the soul is mostly confined to minds imbued with the Platonic influence. We have adverted to

[1] Consol, ad Apoll., 4.
[2] Republic, x. 606. (Jowett, ii. 448).

the gloomy disbelief that prevailed in a class of whom the elder Pliny is an example.[1] The Epicureans were avowed free-thinkers, and at the close of the civil wars, the Epicurean creed was popular at Rome. We have already adverted to the fact that Julius Cæsar, in an address to the Senate against the infliction of capital punishment upon the associates of Catiline, maintained that death would be a less severe penalty, since it would end all life and sensation; the idea of a survival of the soul he treated as a chimera.[2] Tacitus, who was not without a belief in the existence of the gods, and in their providential agency, shows himself to be a doubting adherent of the opinion of Chrysippus that the souls of the most worthy survive until the final conflagration. In the beautiful apostrophe with which he closes the Life of Agricola, he desires that "if there be any habitation for the shades of the virtuous; if, as philosophers suppose, exalted souls do not perish with the body;" the illustrious dead may repose in peace, and recall his kindred from vain laments to the contemplation of his virtues.

In the second century, along with the revival of the ancient religion, and the restoration of political order, philosophy played a more important part as an educator among the Romans than it had ever done before.[3] There had been not only a popular dislike of philosophers, but also a strong prejudice against any absorbing devotion to philosophical study, which was felt by persons like Tacitus, on the ground that it diverted men's minds from the affairs of state, and made them poor citizens. For political reasons partly, from a sense of the dangerous tendency of philosophical thinking, philosophers had been repeatedly banished from

[1] See above, p. 132. [2] Sallust, B. C. 50.

[3] See, on this subject, Boissier, *La Religion Romaine*, etc., ii. 410 seq.

Rome in the course of the first century; but, after the death of Domitian, philosophy not only gained a toleration, but often received an effective personal patronage from the Emperors. There was still a popular antipathy from the supposed uselessness of studies and discussions of this nature, and from the Pharisaical character of many who were devoted to them. There was, also, a vehement opposition from the rhetoricians like Quintilian, who had to defend themselves against censorious criticism, and who claimed that ethics was embraced in their own art, since virtue was an essential quality of a true orator. A great number of the noblest minds embraced Stoicism, though the systems of Epicurus, and the Eclectic school were not without numerous adherents. Philosophers taught in schools, delivering lectures which were often received with great applause, and taking under their oversight the entire conduct of the young men who adopted them as guides in the formation of character. Their exactions were sometimes severe, and their rebukes faithful. Besides the work of philosophers in this public capacity as the heads of schools, they exerted their influence in a more private relation. They were sometimes received into the families of the great in the character of spiritual advisers. As a pastor or confessor, the philosopher solved questions of duty, gave counsel, and administered consolation, in the household where he took up his abode. In certain cases, he accompanied to the place of execution, and soothed in the last moments of life, persons sentenced to death, ostensibly for political offences. If these household instructors, like chaplains in great families in more modern times, were, according to the descriptions of Lucian, occasionally subject to indignities, there is no doubt that not unfrequently they held a dignified and useful position. Princes associated with these philosophers for the sake of their instructive companionship.

There was a certain class of philosophers, the Cynics, who engaged in a distinctively missionary work. Like mendicant friars, they perambulated the streets and highways, offering their doctrine and their rebukes to whomsoever they chose to address. Hated and despised as they were, not unfrequently with good cause, there were not wanting among them individuals of a mild spirit, and of disinterested, noble aims. Epictetus, in one of his Discourses, has sketched the ideal of the Cynic Missionary.[1] He who takes upon him this work, it is said, must not do it without divine guidance. He must not presumptuously take this office upon himself. He must divest himself of discontent, and of all the excitements of passion. He must purify his mind; learn to despise the body, and give up all dread of death. He must be, and feel himself to be, a messenger from Zeus to men, and must tell them the truth at all hazards. He must give up house, land, property, and external comforts of all sorts, and take up with the hardest fare. He must not return evil for evil, but as a brother love those who beat him. He must, as the servant of Zeus, be indifferent to Cæsar or to Proconsul. He must be without the distraction of worldly care—Epictetus uses the same word (ἀπερισπάστως) with Paul (1 Cor. vii. 35) —that he may be entirely attentive to the service of God; and for this reason he must abstain from marriage. He must have a sound bodily constitution, so that his pure doctrine and exalted standard may not be attributed to the accident of bodily infirmity. He must be endowed with natural tact and acuteness. He must, above all, be free from every vice, with his reason clearer than the sun. Few, if any, fulfilled the lofty ideal which the Stoic sage presents of one who undertakes to reform and guide his fellow-men. Yet it is interesting to know that such an

[1] Diss., iii. 22.

ideal was exhibited, and that, here and there, an individual was found who made some near approach to the realization of it.

Philosophy yielded a certain amount of strength and solace to able and cultivated men; an increased amount, we may say, among the Romans, in the second century, as compared with the age that witnessed the introduction of Christianity. The Stoics looked forward to a continuance for an indefinite, though limited period, of personal life beyond the grave. Platonists may not unfrequently have cherished a larger hope. But it must be remembered that philosophy exerted no appreciable influence on the mass of mankind, either in the way of restraint or of inspiration. They were left in the adversities of life, in sickness, in bereavement, and in death, to such consolation as was to be drawn from the old mythological system. The epitaphs in memory of the dead in some cases betray a crass materialism, in other cases a bitter and resentful despair; while many express a hope in behalf of the beloved who are gone, which is slow to be extinguished in the human heart.

When we look back upon the ancient philosophy in its entire course, we find in it nothing nearer to Christianity than the saying of Plato that man is to resemble God. But, on the path of speculation, how defective and discordant are the conceptions of God! And if God were adequately known, how shall the fetters of evil be broken, and the soul attain to its ideal? It is just these questions that Christianity meets through the revelation of God in Jesus Christ. God, the Head of that universal society on which Cicero delighted to dwell, is brought near, in all His purity and love, to the apprehension, not of a coterie of philosophers merely, but of the humble and ignorant.

There is a real deliverance from the burden of evil, achieved through Christ, actually for Himself, and potentially for mankind. How altered in their whole character are the ethical maxims which, in form, may not be without a parallel in heathen sages! Forgiveness, forbearance, pity for the poor, universal compassion, are no longer abstractions, derived from speculation on the attributes of Deity. They are a part of the example of God. He has so dealt with us in the mission and death of His Son.[1] The Cross of Christ was the practical power that annihilated artificial distinctions among mankind, and made human brotherhood a reality. In this new setting, ethical precepts gain a depth of earnestness and a force of impression which heathen philosophy could never impart. We might as well claim for starlight the brightness and warmth of a noon-day sun.

[1] See Col. iii. 12; Eph. iv. 32; 1 Pet. ii. 18; 2 Cor. x. 1; Luke xxii. 27; John xiii. 14; 1 John iii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Eph. v. 2; Phil. ii. 7; and the New Testament *passim*.

CHAPTER VI.

THE STATE OF MORALS IN ANCIENT HEATHEN SOCIETY.

BENEATH the tranquillity that prevailed under the rule of Augustus Cæsar, there appeared appalling signs of exhaustion and decay in the central portions of the Roman Empire. The world was weary of strife, and resigned itself to the sway of a master who was supported by a standing army of 340,000 men, and who, by absorbing the various magistracies in his own person, knew how to combine the substance of absolute power with the forms of republican government. But the decay of that virile energy, the loss of that virtue, which had carried Rome forward on its career of conquest, were visible on every hand. The civil wars, from the time of Sylla, had desolated the most flourishing regions of the Empire. The wars in Gaul had been attended with an enormous destruction of life in that country. Of these wars Plutarch says that Cæsar had not pursued them for ten years "when he had taken by storm 800 towns, subdued 300 states, and of the 3,000,000 of men who made up the gross sum of those with whom at several times he engaged, he had killed 1,000,000, and taken captive a second."[1] This loss of population was partially made up by the large influx of Roman colonists. There were countries, like Sicily and Egypt, whose extraordinary fertility enabled them to recover rapidly from the devastating effects of war, and to furnish supplies of food to provinces whose agriculture was blighted. Greece, as a

[1] Vita Cæsaris.

consequence of the Macedonian and Roman wars, was covered with ruins. The most of her renowned cities were reduced to villages. Corinth only, favored by its situation, rose from its ashes, and gained rapidly in population and wealth—the increase of luxury and profligacy keeping pace with its growth. The nobler qualities of the Hellenic race had vanished. Still proud of their blood, dexterous, supple, unprincipled, and accomplished in the art of catering to the appetite for amusement and sensual indulgence, they swarmed in Italy and Rome, and infected the whole atmosphere of domestic and social life with their pestiferous influence. Juvenal pours out his wrath at seeing "a Grecian capital in Italy,"[1] and his scorn at

> "The flattering, cringing, treacherous, artful race,
> Of fluent tongue, and never-blushing face,
> A Protean tribe, one knows not what to call,
> That shifts to every form, and shines in all."[2]

"Greece," he says, "is a theatre where all are players;" this versatile, insincere, sensual race "make all parts their

[1] ——"non possum ferre, Quirites,
Græcam urbem." Sat. iii.

[2] These lines of Gifford are a free paraphrase of the original: —

"Ingenium velox, audacia perdita, sermo
Promptus, et Isæo torrentior: ede quid illum
Esse putes? quemvis hominem secum attulit ad nos:
Grammaticus, Rhetor, Geometres, Pictor, Aliptes,
Augur, Schœnobates, Medicus, Magus: omnia novit:
Græculus esuriens in Cœlum, jusseris, ibit." Sat. iii. 73-78.

A more literal rendering is that of Madan:—

"A quick wit, desperate impudence, speech
Ready, and more rapid than Isæus. Say—what do you
Think him to be? He has brought us with himself what
man you please:
Grammarian, Rhetorician, Geometrician, Painter, Anointer,
Augur, Rope-dancer, Physician, Wizard: he knows all things.
A hungry Greek will go into heaven, if you command."

own;" they cast an enchantment over all, and defile whatever they touch.

The population of Italy, like that of Greece, was diminishing. The slaughter of men in battle was a cause, but not the chief cause, of this remarkable fact. The country was blighted by slavery, to which more than to any other agency the fall of Rome was eventually due. In the room of the farmers who had once owned the soil which they tilled, and who had filled the Roman armies with hardy soldiers, were the few great proprietors, each with his throng of bondmen who toiled in the fields with fetters on their limbs. Thus the race of independent Italian yeomen was extirpated. It was one consequence of this calamitous change, that numerous acres, which had previously been cultivated with the plough and the spade, were turned into grazing land. The grain and the wine which had once been produced at home were now imported from abroad. Moreover, the small land-owners who had been left, were expelled from their homes, in large numbers, to give place to the disbanded soldiers of the legions of Augustus. These, disinclined to labor, and having no relish for their new abodes, parted with their property—thus enlarging further the estates of the great slave-holders—and resorted to Rome, to swell the multitude of vagabonds who rushed to the Capital from all quarters, for purposes of pleasure or crime, or in order to feed at the public crib. The population of Rome exceeded 1,000,000, and, in the first half of the second century, probably rose to double this number."[1] In the vast throng that crowded its narrow streets, which ran between houses built higher than in other ancient cities, were mingled the costumes of every nation, and the confused accents of a

[1] See Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms.*, i. 54 seq., where the calculations of Bunsen, Zumpt, Marquardt, and others are considered.

hundred dialects. No small fraction of this motley populace was made up of the scum of all the provinces. Juvenal complains that

> "Long since the stream that wanton Syria laves,
> Has disembogued its filth in Tiber's waves." [1]

A host of adventurers had come to insinuate themselves into the confidence of the great, and to step into their shoes.[2] Not less than 200,000 persons were supported by donations of money and provisions from the government. To these we are to add legions of mendicants, who picked up their living by beggary or theft, and lodged at night in the porticoes of temples and of other public edifices. There was never a more terrible contrast between the extremes of wealth and poverty, the opulence and luxury of the few, and the destitution of the many. Slavery had rendered all manual industry disreputable. Even Cicero takes this view, making an exception only in favor of the fine arts, where money is not the sole object of pursuit. Ordinary trade is stigmatized as unworthy; teaching, and commerce on a large scale, he regards as not unbecoming.

Of course, in forming an estimate of the state of morals at any given time, caution is requisite. The vehement rebukes of an austere philosopher, and the humorous exaggerations of a satirist, cannot be literally taken. We must guard against generalizing from exceptional instances of depravity. In the worst times of Rome, there were men of probity, and women of unsullied virtue. There were families bound together by tender affection. There were brave and generous actions, and examples of high courage

[1] "Jam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes
Et linguam et mores et cum tibicine chordas
Obliquas nec non gentilia tympana secum
Vexit et ad Circem jussas prostare puellas." Sat. iii. 62–65.

[2] Viscera magnarum domuum dominique futuri." Juvenal, *Sat.* iii. 73.

and self-sacrifice for the public good. There were not wanting individuals to protest against the baseness and corruption of their age. And we must not overlook the extent of profligacy that may exist in our own day, in Christian countries, and especially in populous cities. But when all allowances are made, there can be no doubt that ancient society, at the particular period of which we are speaking, presented a scene of unexampled demoralization. "To see the world in its worst estate we turn to the age of the satirists and of Tacitus, when all the different streams of evil, coming from east, west, north, south, the vices of barbarism and the vices of civilization, remnants of ancient cults, and the latest refinements of luxury and impurity, met and mingled on the banks of the Tiber."[1] Some scholars have been disposed to deny that the mythological religion, through the stories of vice and crime perpetrated by the objects of worship, tended to corrupt the popular mind. It has been claimed that the noble and beautiful forms which art gave to the divinities must have exerted on their beholders an elevating influence. But these same divinities were believed to be capable of the worst forms of iniquity. What must have been the effect of this belief on the young? It is idle to call in question the judgment of Aristotle and Plato on this point. The latter, speaking of the stories in Homer about the heroes, as well as the deities, says: "They are likely to have a bad effect on those who hear them; for everybody will begin to excuse his own vices when he is convinced that similar wickednesses are always being perpetrated by the kindred of the gods."[2] But Homer was the

[1] Professor Jowett, *Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 75.

[2] Καὶ μὴν τοῖς γε ἀκούουσι βλαβερά· πᾶς γὰρ ἑαυτῷ ξυγγνώμην ἕξει κακῷ ὄντι, πεισθεὶς ὡς ἄρα τοιαῦτα πράττουσί τε καὶ ἔπραττον καὶ οἱ θεῶν ἀγχίσποροι, Ζηνὸς ἐγγύς, etc. Rep. iii. 391 (Jowett ii. 216). See, also, Aristotle, *Polit.* vii. 17.

one school-book of Grecian youth. Euthyphro justifies his treatment of his own father by appealing to the example of Zeus; and Socrates, denying that the story is true, says that his rejection of these impious myths was at the bottom of the charge of impiety which was commonly brought against him.[1] The causes of social demoralization in the age of Augustus were manifold; of the fact there is abundant evidence. When the Apostle Paul, in the opening of his Letter to the Romans, describes the hideous vices that prevailed among the heathen, he speaks as an eye-witness.[2] That terrible indictment is not more severe than the indignant assertions of Seneca. He compares society, where every one makes his profit by injuring somebody else, to the life of gladiators, who live together to fight each other. "All things," he says, "are full of crimes and vices. More is perpetrated than can be removed by force. There is a struggle to see which will excel in iniquity. Daily the appetite for sin increases, the sense of shame diminishes. Casting away all respect for right and justice, lust hurries whithersoever it will. Crimes are no longer secret; they stalk before the eyes of men. Iniquity has so free a course in public, it so dominates in all hearts, that innocence is not only rare—it does not exist at all. It is not a case of violations of law in individual cases, few in number. From all sides, as at a given signal, men rush together, confounding good and evil."[3] He then proceeds to specify, in a long catalogue, the

[1] Euthyph., 5. (Jowett, i. 305.)

[2] Rom. i. 24–32.

[3] "Nunquam irasci desinet sapiens, si semel coeperit; omnia sceleribus et vitiis plena sunt; plus committitur, quam quod possit coercitione sanari. Certatur ingenti quodam nequitiæ certamine: major quotidie peccandi cupiditas, minor verecundia est. Expulso melioris æquiorisque respectu, quocunque visum est, libido se impingit; nec furtiva jam scelera sunt; præter oculos eunt: adeoque in publicum missa nequitia est, et in omnibus pectoribus evaluit, ut innocentia non rara, sed nulla

forms of iniquity, some of them revolting and unnatural crimes, which exhibited themselves on every hand. We must allow something for the spirit of declamation that belongs to the Roman philosopher; yet his testimony is borne out in its general tenor by other evidence. The contrast between the Rome of an earlier age, and Rome as it had then come to be, through these social evils, was a theme of indignant and sorrowful remark. It is true that the Roman community at the outset was virtuous. The people were temperate, industrious, and, after a manner, conscientious. The domestic, as well as the public virtues, prevailed. But after the power of Rome had spread, after the conquest of Carthage and Corinth, followed by the subjugation of the East and of Egypt; after the incoming of wealth, the acquaintance with Asiatic luxury and vice, the committal of the young to Greek pedagogues, the spread of Greek mythology and art, and the introduction of the Greek stage, the old Roman character was broken down. The absence of a certain refinement, which belonged to the Greeks even when they were steeped in sensuality, led to an indulgence in loathsome excesses, such as gluttony, to which we find the Romans addicted.

In considering the state of morals among the ancient nations, we single out certain topics for special remark.[1]

sit. Numquid enim singuli et pauci rupere legem? Undique, velut signo dato, ad fas nefasque, miscendum coorti sunt." *De Ira*, ii. 8.

[1] On the morals of the ancient heathen society, see Tholuck's Essays in Neander's *Denkwürdigkeiten*, vol. i. (1823); translated in the *Bibl. Repository*, vol. ii. Those essays, though presenting a mass of unquestionable facts, were designed to exhibit the dark side of heathenism. The more pleasing features of ancient society Neander was to present in another essay, which, however, was not written. A plea for the beneficial influence of Greek art was made by F. Jacob, in his essay *Ueber die Erziehung d. Hellenen zur Sittlichkeit*, translated in the *Classical Studies* published by Sears, Edwards, and Felton (Boston, 1843). See, however,

1. *Immoralities connected with worship.* Among various nations of antiquity, human sacrifices were in vogue. The Tyrians and Carthaginians threw children into the fire as an offering to Moloch. The Druidical priests in Gaul slaughtered human victims. In pre-historic times, human sacrifices had been practised by the Greeks and Romans. The far-famed story of Iphigenia is an illustration of this primitive custom. In later ages the Greek and Roman feeling did not countenance this sort of brutality. Yet isolated examples are recorded of the revival of the horrible custom. In the year 227 B. C., when it was found in the Sibylline books that Gauls and Greeks were destined to overpower the city, the Romans, in order to verify the prediction and thus to save themselves from ruin, caused a man and woman of these nations to be buried alive in the forum. It is said that Sextus Pompeius, at a time when a storm had shattered the fleet of his enemy, caused living men, as well as horses, to be cast into the sea as an offering to Neptune. A decree of the Senate, B. C. 95, had abolished human sacrifices; but the elder Pliny tells us that in his time they were still occasionally made. There seems to be reason to believe, although the fact has been doubted by some, that Augustus, after the surrender of Perusia, caused 300 captives to be sacrificed on the altar of Julius.[1]

Licentiousness entered into the rites of heathen worship. Prostitution was not made a part of religious service among the Babylonians and other Semitic peoples alone.

Gieseler's criticism upon Jacob's view, *Kirchengesch.* I. 29, n. 1. There is a full discussion of the subject by Dr. Döllinger in his *Heidenthum u. Judenthum.* But the facts adduced by this learned writer are not always strictly verifiable. Lampoons and gossip were not more trustworthy in ancient times than they are now. Compare the anecdotes of Julius Cæsar taken up by Döllinger (p. 719) from Suetonius, with the remarks of Merivale, *History of the Romans,* ii. 390.

[1] Suet., *Octav.* 15, Seneca, *de Clem.*, i. 11 ("post Perusinas aras").

It was practised, likewise, in honor of Aphrodite at Corinth. The indecent songs, symbols, and revelry, which attended the Bacchanalian and other festivals, cannot be mentioned in detail. The Bacchic orgies were carried by the Greeks to Etruria, and being thence transferred to Rome, led to most indecent and iniquitous excesses; so that the consuls, in the year 189 B. C., interfered to suppress ceremonies that involved murder, as well as gross debauchery. At that time, seven thousand persons in Rome were united in the practice of these frightful orgies. Livy states that subsequently a Prætor condemned to death, in one year, 3,000 persons on the charge of poisoning, where crime was mixed up with religion.[1] The Romans, notwithstanding their earlier regard for decency, admitted rites of an opposite character. Mythological stories, which were adapted to excite the baser propensities, were represented in pictures and statues, and swelled the tide of corruption which beat with ever increasing force against the ancient barriers of chastity and order.

2. *The character and position of women.* In Greece, women enjoyed relatively less freedom, and less influence in their families, in the age of Pericles than in the Homeric period. Little pains were taken with their education. Before their marriage, they were kept in seclusion, and under watch. After their marriage, they managed their households, governed their children and slaves; but they had their own apartments, separate from the husband, and seldom left their dwellings. They ate at the same table with their husbands, but did not do this when he had guests, nor did they go out with him when he took meals with his friends abroad. The purity of the wife and mother was guarded by strict laws; but the utmost laxity in this respect was allowed to males. Higher ideas

[1] Livy xxxi. 8–19. See Döllinger, p. 482.

in regard to the education of females, and the relation of the wife to the husband, are found in Plato and Plutarch.[1] But Plato was so far governed by the prevalent view that the prime object of the marriage relation was to raise up citizens, strong in body as well as of sound mind, and was so oblivious of the spiritual nature of marriage, that he makes a community of wives one characteristic of the ideal republic. Cultivated Greeks made companions of the hetæræ, or courtesans, who were sometimes witty and educated. So innocent was the occupation of this class of persons deemed to be that we find Socrates making a visit to Theodota, who was one of them, and giving her advice on the best means of prosecuting her business of winning and keeping "friends."[2] The profligacy that reigned in the declining age of Grecian history is illustrated in the story of Phryne. This famous courtesan amassed such wealth that she could offer to build the walls of Thebes. Praxiteles and Hyperides were among her adorers; and when she was charged with Atheism, the latter secured her acquittal by bidding her unveil her bosom to the eyes of the judges. Finally at Eleusis, in the presence of myriads of spectators from all Greece, she personated Venus by entering naked into the waves.

In Rome, the wife from the first had a higher position in the household. Notwithstanding the absolute authority in the family, which was conceded to the husband, she was more his companion. Matrons of the type of Cornelia were a subject of patriotic pride. Matrimonial fidelity was for a long period remarkably observed. The Romans boasted that for the first five hundred years of their history, there was no instance of divorce. But the old sentiments rapidly passed away under the influence of Hellenism, and in the general decline of Roman character. As

[1] Plutarch, *de Amore*, 24, 25. [2] Xenophon, *Mem.*, iii. 11.

early as 131 B. C., Metellus Macedonicus, who was held in general admiration for his honorable domestic life, in a speech described marriage as an oppressive burden which citizens would gladly be clear of, but which they were bound to undertake from a sense of duty.[1] Divorce became more and more common. Marcus Cato did not hesitate to part from his wife, with the consent of her father, and to hand her over to his friend, Hortensius; and then, after his death, to marry her again.[2] The form of marriage which involved the stricter legal and religious sanctions, gradually disappeared, and marriages without the *manus*, admitting of easy separation, became universal. Divorces came to be events of every-day occurrence. Cicero divorced his wife, with whom he had lived for thirty years, and married a young woman of wealth. Her, also, he soon divorced. Seneca speaks of "illustrious and noble" women who reckoned time not by the number of the consuls, but by the number of their successive husbands.[3] Meantime, seduction and adultery spread until Roman society had become a sink of pollution. "Liaisons in the first houses," says Mommsen, "had become so frequent, that only a scandal altogether exceptional could make them the subject of special talk; a judicial interference seemed now almost ridiculous."[4] The Roman aristocracy, in the warm season, flocked to the watering-places of Baiæ and Puteoli, where women mixed in political intrigues, and, with young effeminate Roman fops at their side, devoted themselves to the amusements and vices peculiar to these places of fashionable resort. The stage acquired an irresistible fascination, and women belonging to high families appeared upon it as dancers. It was one feature of this

[1] See Mommsen, iii. 502.
[2] Plutarch, *Cato Min.*, vii. 57.
[3] De Beneficiis, iii. 16.
[4] Mommsen, iv. 618.

demoralized condition of society that men refused to marry. They preferred an illicit gratification of the senses, and shrank from the burdens incident to a connection with such women as were open to their choice, addicted as they were to habits of profuse expenditure. The efforts of Augustus to promote marriages by legal enactments, which offered bounties to those who would take wives, had little effect. Where marriages took place, the children were few in number, and parents preferred, for pecuniary reasons, to remain almost or altogether childless. Such parents could quote the authority of Cato who said, that it was the "duty of a citizen to keep great wealth together, and therefore not to beget too many children."[1] If a tithe of what Juvenal and contemporary writers say on this matter is true, licentiousness pervaded all ranks of Roman society. The example was furnished in the imperial family. One has only to remember the almost incredible wickedness of Messalina, the wife of Claudius I., as she is described by Tacitus, to learn to what an unexampled abyss of profligacy a Roman woman of the highest rank could descend.[2] The multitudes of slaves presented an ever present temptation to sensual indulgence. This degradation of woman, this all-pervading impurity, belonged to the provinces as well as the capital.

3. *Luxury and Extravagance.* Friedländer maintains that the common representations on this point are exaggerated.[3] Too much has been built upon exceptional incidents of wild extravagance, as, for example, the stories of costly pearls dissolved, and swallowed from the goblet, in some fit of mad caprice. The monstrous prodigality of certain emperors, as Nero and Caligula, is not to be attri-

[1] Mommsen, iv. 613.
[2] Tacitus, Annal. xi. 26, 27; Dio Cassius, lx. 18, 31.
[3] See *Die Sittengesch. Roms.*, iii. 1 seq.

buted to their subjects, nor even to other emperors, some of whom, like Vespasian, were noted for frugality. If the Romans sought for new delicacies for the table, one consequence was that they were led to naturalize in Italy a great variety of animals and plants which are useful for food. Even the vine, with the art of cultivating it, had been transplanted at an earlier day from Greece. What was censured by the men of austere views is often something connected with food or dress which no one objects to at present. For example, Pliny and Seneca inveigh against the use of snow for cooling drinks, as an unnatural luxury. It was then something new; but so far from being considered a superfluity, ice has become an article of indispensable convenience, especially in southern latitudes. The entertainments of the higher class of Romans, their wardrobes, their silver, and jewels, when compared with what is witnessed now among the rich, hardly justify the ordinary judgment. Neither were the incomes of rich persons in private life then larger than the incomes of individuals of the same class in Europe and America now. Anecdotes relating to Roman habits may create astonishment, when in truth due examination will show that they are not without a parallel in modern society. It must be remembered, however, that the Romans had been a frugal people, living upon the products of their own soil. The influx of commodities from every quarter of the globe, through conquest and commerce, produced a vast and rather sudden revolution in their habits. It may be true that bills of fare of grand feasts at Rome do not display a more profuse variety of meats and viands than a Lord Mayor's dinner. But unless all testimonies are false, there was a coarse appetite for food, a gluttony, which finds no analogy in the higher circles of modern society. To pay two hundred and fifty dollars for a single fish—the mullet—was

no doubt unusual; yet occasional instances of this kind throw light upon the drift of social habits at the time when they occurred. The humorous passage in which Juvenal describes the assembling of the chiefs of state, at the call of Domitian, to determine how a turbot should be cooked, is equally significant.[1] The reader of Cicero's letters will remember the description of his reception of Julius Cæsar at his country villa, where it is incidentally mentioned that the Dictator took an emetic in connection with his dinner.[2] It was no uncommon thing for Roman gentlemen to take this method of relieving the stomach of its contents, in order that they might indulge the appetite with impunity, or prolong the pleasures of the table beyond the wants or capacity of nature.[3] There is no evidence that this loathsome custom was, usually at least, from a sanitary motive, not connected with intemperance in eating. Suppers were extended far into the night. Female slaves waited on the tables, attired in a way to excite the passions of the guests whom they served; and when they were inflamed with wine, dancing-girls were introduced, and a scene of coarse revelry ensued. The enormous expenditure in baths, in villas with their gardens and fish-ponds, in magnificent sepulchres, and in works of art of every description, needs no illustration. The sumptuary laws which were frequently issued, but which were violated by those who made them, testify to a general sense of the fact that a headlong passion for luxurious living was breaking through the bounds of propriety and of traditional custom. Speaking of the later days of the Republic, Mommsen says:[4] "Extravagant prices, as much as

[1] Sat. iv.

[2] This passage is quoted in Forsyth's *Life of Cicero*, ii. 167.

[3] Compare Seneca, *ad Helviam:* "Vomunt ut edant, edunt ut vomant."

[4] Vol. iii. p. 501.

100,000 sesterces (£1,000) were paid for an exquisite cook. Houses were constructed with special reference to this object." "A dinner was already described as poor, at which the fowls were served up to the guests entire, and not merely the choice portions." "At banquets, above all, the Romans displayed their hosts of slaves ministering to luxury, their bands of musicians, their dancing-girls, their elegant furniture, their carpets glittering with gold, or pictorially embroidered, their rich silver plate." Luxury went on increasing in defiance of all laws designed to curb it. It should be observed that the period when luxury and extravagance were at their height includes the latter days of the Republic, and the century that followed the battle of Actium, extending to the reign of Vespasian.

4. *Unnatural Vice and Pollution.* In any comparison of ancient society with Christian times, it is impossible to pass over in absolute silence practices too revolting to admit of more than a passing allusion.[1] The unnatural sensuality on which the Apostle Paul poured out his indignant reprobation, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, prevailed to a frightful extent among the Greeks, and was taught by them to the Romans. In Greece the passion for beautiful boys (*παιδεραστία*) was relieved, in some slight degree, of its grossness, by an infusion of æsthetic sentiment. This kind of love, springing in part from the adoration of beauty, assumed all the characteristics of a sentimental attachment between persons of different sexes. Assiduous devotion to the object beloved, rivalship, jealousy, despair—all the phenomena of courtship and love—were connected with this unnatural relation, and served to cloak, even to the eyes of philosophers, the shameless indecency that belonged to it. There is scarcely a writer of Greece who

[1] The facts and the evidence are presented by Döllinger and by Tholuck. See above, p. 197, n. 1.

directly condemns it. One effect of it was to disincline men to marriage, as both Plato and Plutarch remarked; and so this disgusting vice contributed to the reduction of the population of Greece, as well as to the moral ruin of her people. Like most other Greek vices, this form of impurity took root and flourished in Rome. Statesmen, judges, generals, and emperors were guilty of it. At the end of the sixth century, A. U. C., Polybius states that many Romans paid as high as a talent ($1000) for a beautiful boy. Cicero speaks of a case in which the sons of Senators, and youth from the highest families, obtained from the judges an acquittal, which a bribe of money could not procure, by this species of prostitution. Slaves were more commonly the victims of this base affection. All pains were then taken to stunt their growth and preserve their fresh and effeminate appearance; and the same thing was done in the case of free persons. The fact that stories imputing the vice of which we are speaking to a man like Julius Cæsar, were in circulation, and formed a matter for jesting,[1] even if the stories were false, shows the measure of toleration that was granted to practices which in modern times, would render the perpetrator of them an outcast and an object of loathing.[2]

5. *Infanticide.* That sense of the sacredness of human life which prevails at the present day, is due to Christianity, and did not exist in the same degree among the nations of antiquity. We might refer to the cruelty that belonged to ancient warfare, as an illustration. The lives, as well as the property, of the captured were a forfeit to the conqueror, and those who were spared were sold into slavery. The surrender of a town, especially if it had made a stubborn resistance, was the signal for an indiscriminate mas-

[1] Suetonius, *Cæsar*, 49, 73.

[2] See Prof. Jowett's remarks, *Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 75.

sacre. Little heed was paid to the distinction between combatants, and the peaceful inhabitants for whom they fought—a distinction which a Christian civilization has at length fully established. A scene like that witnessed at the sack of Magdeburg by Tilly would have caused no surprise in ancient times. It would have been a merciful treatment of a conquered town. How often do we meet in the writers of antiquity statements of which the following is a specimen: "When our soldiers had entered the town, Cæsar sold at auction the entire spoil. He was informed by the purchasers that the number of heads"—people sold to the Roman merchants as slaves—"was fifty-three thousand."[1]

Practices like these might be the natural result of the prevalent ideas of the treatment due to an enemy. But the custom to which we have now to advert could plead no such apology. It rested upon other, and, to say the least, equally repulsive maxims.

The right of parents to destroy the offspring which it was not thought expedient for them to bring up, was recognized in law and practice. Sometimes such children were left by the Greeks to perish by starvation in some desolate place; sometimes they were killed outright. The moral teachers of Greece did not rise above the popular feeling on this subject. Aristotle approves of the custom of exposing infants where it is desired to prevent an excess of population; and, if, in any state, this is forbidden, he recommends abortion as a substitute.[2] Plato, in the Republic, holds that children of bad men, illegitimate children, and children of parents too far advanced in years, should be destroyed by exposure; the state is not to be burdened with them.[3] Among the Romans there had

[1] Bell. Gall., ii. 23.

[2] Aristot., *Polit.* vii. 14, 10.

[3] Rep., v. 459, 460.

been originally a law forbidding the destruction of infants; but this law became practically obsolete. This kind of murder was tolerated and practised. Suetonius, describing the popularity of Germanicus, states that on the occasion of his death, and in honor of him, new-born infants were exposed.[1] Abortion, which was sanctioned by Aristotle and Plato, became very common among the Romans, to escape the pains of child-birth, and especially to get rid of the trouble of rearing children. Customs which found their only apology at the start in the ancient feeling that the state must be furnished with the right number of able-bodied citizens, came to rest at last upon the cruel and ignoble desire to avoid the burdens of the family.

6. *Slavery.* In the principal states of Greece the number of slaves was far in excess of that of the free population. In Attica, at the beginning of the fourth century, B. C., there were 20,000 free citizens, 10,000 foreign settlers who were protected by the State, and 400,000 slaves. In Sparta, the number of actual slaves was relatively less, but if all whose condition differed little from that of servitude were counted, the ratio of freemen to bondmen was not materially different. In Corinth there were said to be 46,000 slaves, and on the island of Ægina, at one time, 470,000; but this must have been before Athens became the centre of commerce.[2] There were great slave markets, as Ephesus, Samos, Athens,—which supplied all Greece. Strabo

[1] Caligula, 5.

[2] This is the statement of Ctesicles (ap. *Athen.* vi. p. 272 c.: see Smith, *Dict. of Gr. and Roman Antiq.*, p. 1035.) Döllinger (*Judenth. u. Heidenth.*), p. 674,) is probably wrong in excluding female slaves from this estimate. Slaves being reckoned as property, all were counted. Not so in the case of citizens and metics. Boeckh (*Public Economy of Athens*, p. 55) estimates the number of slaves in Athens, including women and children, at 365,000. Compare the discussion in Wallon, *Hist. de L'Esclavage dans l'Antiquité*, vol. i. c. viii.

states that in his time tens of thousands of slaves were landed by the Cilician pirates on the island of Delos, in one day. The treatment of slaves by the Greeks was milder than by the Romans.[1] Only those who labored in the mines worked in fetters; but this class were numerous. The Spartan Helots, who were serfs, attached to the soil, were treated with cruelty in later times, when there was more fear from their insubordination. Thucydides says that on one occasion ten thousand of them were persuaded to come forward by the promise of emancipation, and were then treacherously murdered.[2] Slaves in Greece always testified under torture. The master might not kill his slave, but he could beat him so far as to make him a cripple. There was no protection for the chastity of female slaves. When weary of them, their owners might let them or sell them to houses of prostitution.

The stern character of the Roman law appeared in the powers which it gave to the slaveholder.[3] He was clothed with absolute authority; he could beat, maim, and kill his slave with impunity. The slave could own no property, he could contract no marriage; whatever connection he was allowed to form with a woman was dissolved at the command of his owner. Slaves, when they were allowed or forced to give testimony, were examined under the torture. If a master was murdered by a slave, the vengeance of the law was visited upon all the slaves of his household, who were crucified without mercy. Slaves were brought from all directions, but in the largest numbers from Asia. When King Nicomedes of Bithynia was called upon by

[1] On the whole subject of slavery among the Greeks, see Becker, *Charicles*, Th. ii., p. 20 seq.

[2] Hist., B. iv. 80.

[3] Upon the characteristics of Roman slavery, see Becker, *Gallus*, *Excurs.* iii.

Marius to furnish his contingent of auxiliaries, he answered that all his able-bodied subjects had been dragged off into slavery by Roman tax-gatherers. Every Roman of moderate means felt a pride in owning at least a few slaves. There were individuals who owned from ten to twenty thousand, most of them field hands. A freedman in the reign of Augustus, who had lost many slaves, was still able at his death to leave 4,116. Many households were possessed of as many as 500. The slaves in a family were divided into groups, to each of which a special function was assigned. Among them were included carpenters, secretaries, physicians, and architects. The architects and carpenters of Crassus numbered 500. There was nothing to prevent an irritable or drunken master from wreaking his resentment upon a slave, except the pecuniary loss, which, as the market was glutted, was usually small. A slave who had given offence might be sent to the arena, or flung to the fishes. The females appear to have been as cruel and oppressive in the treatment of their servants as the men. Juvenal speaks of those who hire a beadle by the year to lash their servants, and let him go on with his work until he drops the scourge in weariness. A woman of hot temper orders a slave to be crucified without caring to inquire whether he may not be innocent. A petulant female lays the whip over the bare shoulders of the trembling maid who is dressing her hair.[1] Cato's mode of treating his slaves is well known. To prevent them from conspiring together, he sowed dissension and fomented quarrels among them. After a supper where he had sat with his guests, he took his whip and chastised the servants who had failed to do their part to his satisfaction. Worse than all, the old slaves, who could no longer work, he sold for what he could get for

[1] Sat. vi.

them. Generally speaking, slaves were considered, and justly considered, as at heart enemies of the master. In the country, they worked by day in chains, and at night were lodged in the *ergastula*—apartments excavated under ground. Slaves were numerous almost everywhere in the Roman empire, but nowhere was the number so great in proportion to the population as in Rome. Zumpt estimates that at the beginning of the Christian era there were two slaves to one freeman. When we consider the almost irresistible tendency to demoralization among the slaves themselves, the temptations to perfidy, licentiousness, and almost every other vice to which they were exposed, and when we consider the baleful influence which fell, from the unlimited control of all these human beings, upon the masters, and the contamination of the young by their familiarity with slaves, from the beginning of life, we shall feel that the amount of evil resulting from Roman slavery is beyond calculation.[1]

7. *Roman Amusements,—the Stage, the Circus, and the Arena.*[2]

The vast proletariate in Rome were not only hungry, and needed to be fed, but were idle, and needed to be amused. Bread and games—*Panem et Circenses*—were the two things to which they felt they had a right. But the public shows and games became an engrossing passion of the entire populace. The emperors found it well to occupy thus the attention of the people, who were diverted in this way from thoughts of liberty. The great gatherings in the circus and amphitheatre took the place of the assemblies where the Romans had chosen their magistrates

[1] Compare Wallon, ii. c. ix. (Influences de l'Esclavage sur les classes libres).

[2] See, on this whole topic, Friedländer ii. 263–481 (Die Schauspiele), from whom many of the statements which follow have been drawn.

and regulated public affairs. The battles of the arena supplied the place of the contests by which Rome had extended her sway over the world. The exciting performances in the Circus between the Palatine and Aventine, reminded the spectators of the triumphal processions, laden with the spoils of kingdoms, which, for a succession of centuries, had marched over the same ground. In these public places, the emperors showed themselves to their subjects and heard from them expressions of popular feeling.

The theatre was too tame to rival the more stirring exhibitions of the circus and the arena. Yet theatrical performances had a powerful attraction, and exerted a vast influence. The character of these went from bad to worse. Tragedy, which interested only a minority of cultivated persons, could scarcely maintain itself, and found itself obliged to depend for what success it had upon showy scenic representations, in which elephants, giraffes, and other animals, with gorgeously attired men and women, passed in glittering procession across the stage. The Greek comedy, and the Roman plays of the same order, had a larger measure of popular favor. The subjects of the comedy were borrowed largely from the licentious stories of the Greek mythology. But the Pantomime gradually usurped the place of almost every other species of dramatic performance. The art of expression through movement and gesture was carried to a marvellous perfection. The dancers were beheld with an enthusiasm which knew no bounds; and as the mimes were commonly of an unchaste and even obscene character, they had the most corrupting effect upon the morals of women and of youth.

The Circus, in Julius Cæsar's time, furnished seats for 150,000 men. Titus added seats for 100,000 more, and in the fourth century there were places for not less than

385,000.[1] Here were foot-races, feats upon horse-back, such as may be seen in the modern circus, and other like amusements. But the chief thing was the chariot race. About this contest the most interest was gathered. The several combatants were put in, and the chariots and horses owned, by companies—four in number—and thus arose the factions of the circus, each having its characteristic color, and enlisting with the most ardent feeling in behalf of its favorite. Thus the keenest excitement, such as might be evoked by matters of grave and serious moment, was kindled in all classes by a horse-race. When nobles of ancient lineage, and emperors themselves, when even women, entered personally into the contests of the circus and the amphitheatre, the prostration of Roman dignity and virtue seemed complete.

The gladiatorial contests, in which living men, often in large numbers, were set to fight in deadly combat with one another, and with wild beasts, for the amusement of spectators of both sexes, and of every age and rank, are a most impressive sign of the state of moral feeling in the society which beheld these bloody games with increasing delight. It was not until five hundred years after the building of the city, that these games were introduced from Campania and Etruria. They took place in connection with funeral ceremonies, and in honor of deceased friends. First, in 264 B. C., at the obsequies of D. Junius Brutus, three pairs contended in the cattle market. In 216 B. C., at the funeral of M. Æmilius Lepidus, 22 pairs contended in the forum. In 174 B. C., Titus Flaminius, on the death of his father, caused 74 pairs to fight for three days. As the passion for these contests increased, demagogues and magistrates vied with each other in their efforts to minister to it. Julius Cæsar, as Ædile (65 B. C.), caused not less than 320 pairs

[1] Friedländer, ii. 294 (3d ed.).

to fight. At the games which Augustus instituted in his reign, 10,000 men joined in these combats. Trajan, in 106 A. D., after his victories on the Danube, caused gladiatorial fights to be continued for four months, in which 10,000 combatants took part. Besides the games which were given by public authority and by the emperors, there were others, often on a large scale, which were provided by private individuals at their own expense. The amphitheatres, with their circular walls and elliptical arena, grew in their dimensions as the relish for these games increased, until, in the last decade of the first century, the gigantic Coliseum arose, the stupendous ruins of which still remain. The gladiators were condemned criminals, prisoners of war, slaves, and others who were hired, or volunteered, to fight. In the first century, a master might sell his slaves for this purpose. It was a common punishment for slaves who had incurred the displeasure of their owners. Gangs of gladiators were kept by private persons, and either exhibited by them, or let to such as wished to hire them. In some cases they broke out in fierce mutiny; in other cases they manifested a strong attachment to their owners. In the last days of the Republic, they often served their masters as body-guards, or braves. The emperors established gladiatorial schools in various places for the training of combatants for the arena. Immense edifices were constructed for this purpose, each of these establishments being provided with a corps of officials for its management, and with physicians, surgeons, fencing-masters, workmen for the manufacture and repair of weapons, and other persons employed in various capacities. The gladiators were subjected to a rigid training, and a careful diet, and lodged in cells from which they could not escape.[1] On the day before they were

[1] In the ruins of Pompeii, skeletons of gladiators have been found with

to enter the arena, they were treated to a supper in common. There some sent messages, which probably might be the last, to their friends, others gave themselves up recklessly to the gratification of the appetite, and Christians turned the occasion into a fraternal love-feast. Almost incredible statements are made as to the number of animals which were brought into the amphitheatre to be hunted there, and to mangle and devour human beings. In the festival of a hundred days for the dedication of the Coliseum, Titus is said to have brought into the arena 5000 wild beasts of every kind. In the festivals lasting for four months, under the auspices of Trajan, in 106 A. D., 11,000 tame and wild animals were slain. It had created astonishment when Sylla presented a hundred lions; but this achievement was of little account in comparison with what was done afterwards. Animals were hunted and caught in the remotest regions; even the crocodile and hippopotamus, and other beasts extremely difficult to transport, as the giraffe, were brought together for the amusement of the Roman populace. The arrangements of the amphitheatre were adapted to excite in the highest degree, and almost to bewilder, the spectators. The citizens were obliged to wear the white toga. The lower seats were set apart for the senators, in the midst of whom was the gallery of the imperial family; next above them were the equestrian order; higher still the body of citizens, the women sitting apart from the males; and to the topmost benches the rabble were admitted. Over the immense multitude, who thus encompassed the arena, was stretched an awning, parti-colored and reflecting its various hues upon the ground beneath. Strains of instrumental music preceded and accompanied the contests, which were intro-

iron fetters upon them, who, not being able to fly, were slowly buried under the ashes of Vesuvius.

duced by a procession of gladiators around the arena, when the greeting may have been addressed to the Emperor: "Ave, Cæsar, Imperator, morituri te salutant!" When a combatant was struck down, the victor appealed to the assembly of spectators to decide the fate of his fallen antagonist. Menials touched the slain with hot irons to see that death was not simulated. They were dragged out to the dead-room, where those in whom life was not extinct were despatched. At intervals, servants appeared to spade up the ground, saturated with blood, and to spread over it a new coating of sand. The diversions of the amphitheatre were far from being limited to conflicts between men, or between men and animals, or among animals themselves. By ingenious and elaborate machinery, a stage could be made to rise from beneath the ground, and then suddenly, with the men, and beasts and whatever else was upon it, to sink out of sight. At the appointed moment, a platform would fall to pieces, and the man, who was standing upon it, would drop into a cage of wild beasts, and be instantly torn in pieces before the eyes of all. The boys and girls would be pleased with the gilded apparel and bright crown of one who came forward in the arena, when they would see the flames burst forth from his dress, and behold him leaping and writhing in agony until death ended his torture.[1]

The Romans were not satisfied with seeing men engage in mortal combat in pairs and squads. They wanted to see earnest fighting, and bloodshed on a larger scale. Spectacles of this nature, therefore, were presented to them. Julius Cæsar celebrated his triumph by an actual battle of this sort in the Circus, where there fought on each side 500 footmen, 300 cavalry, and 20 elephants with men in

[1] Plutarch, *de sera Numinis Vindicta*, 9.

towers upon their backs. This was only one of a series of bloody encounters between large bodies of men, which the emperors caused to take place for the diversion of the populace. Julius Cæsar, in the year 46 B. C., as a part of his triumphal games, caused a lake to be dug out on Mars' Field, and a sea-fight to take place upon it between a Tyrian and an Egyptian fleet, in which were a thousand soldiers, and two thousand oarsmen. Augustus gave another sea-fight, upon an artificial lake, made in Cæsar's garden, on the other side of the Tiber, where three thousand soldiers were engaged. These and various other battles upon the water were thrown into the shade by the great sea-fight which Claudius caused to take place on Lake Fucinus, at the completion of a public work there, where, under the eyes of an innumerable multitude that covered the neighboring shores and hills, two fleets, with nineteen thousand armed men on board, engaged in a sanguinary combat. Over this struggle, where mimicry and stern reality were blended, the Emperor presided, with Agrippina, clad in a mantle refulgent with gold, at his side.[1]

It must be remembered that the gladiatorial games instituted by the emperors and other high officers of state, were not the only contests of this kind. Similar exhibitions on private account, and on a larger or smaller scale, were very frequent in Italy and elsewhere. Among the most durable monuments of antiquity are the amphitheatres which are found wherever the Roman rule extended.

The Greeks were at first averse to these exhibitions, where the human form was gashed and mangled. But this repugnance diminished with familiarity. Josephus tells us that, in Judea, Herod Agrippa had 700 pairs contend in one

[1] See the description of Tacitus, *Annal.*, xii. 56.

day.[1] In all the provinces of the empire, these brutal and brutalizing spectacles were exhibited. The Latin writers, with the exception of Seneca in a single passage, give them their approval. Abhorrent to the spirit of Christianity, they were denounced by Christian teachers from the outset. Constantine was the first to condemn them in an edict. But this inhuman diversion continued at Rome until the reign of Honorius (404 A. D.). Telemachus, an Asiatic monk, leaped into the arena to separate two combatants, and was stoned to death by the people, who were angry at this interference with their pleasure. But he was honored as a martyr, and the laws of Honorius, prohibiting these contests, were obeyed.[2]

One may ask how it was possible for men and women to enjoy spectacles of agony and death, the bare narrative of which excites an emotion of horror. We may be aided in some slight degree to comprehend this, by recollecting how throngs will gather now to witness a bull-fight or a prize-fight; and still more, by the scenes that took place formerly in connection with public executions. But Christianity has so far modified the sentiments that no modern custom can afford more than a faint parallel to the brutality of the amphitheatre. What a ghastly impression is made when we find Ovid, at a time when the sexes were not seated apart, speaking of this as a fit place for the lover to prosecute his suit: he can discuss the programme with his companion, say soft things in the intervals between the combats, and join her in a wager as to the result of the contest which ends in the butchery of one or the other of the combatants.[3] We can account for such a state of things only by the fact that the gladiators were considered as condemned or worthless men, for whose lives nobody cared. Human rights

[1] Antiq., xix. 7, 5.
[2] Theodoret, *H. E.*, v. 26.
[3] Ars Am. i., 164 seq.

and human equality were the vague theories of a few philosophers. International law existed only in its rudiments. Luxury and vice had dulled the appetite for diversions less terrible and exciting.

Such was the state of society in the first century. Nor was there wanting a consciousness of the decay and approaching ruin of all things which men had most valued. The noblest men took refuge in Stoicism; and suicide was frequent among them. A vein of melancholy runs through the histories of Tacitus. Repeatedly he adverts to the wrath of the gods against the Roman state, as a fact to be taken for granted. He apologizes for the interminable catalogue of crimes and sufferings which he is compelled to record. "The more I meditate," he says, "upon the events of ancient and modern times, the more I am impressed with the capricious uncertainty which mocks the calculations of men."[1] He was oppressed by the contemplation of the gloomy drama of human history. It was not a period of hope, but of sadness and despair. The world seemed to have stopped its motion and to have begun to dissolve itself into the primitive chaos. An incurable internal disease had fastened upon the Roman State, and what was there beyond it?

Licentiousness and cruelty, the two characteristic vices of ancient society, which produced a brood of unnatural sins and crimes, did not prevail, to be sure, in an equal degree in the different periods of ancient history. Under Trajan and the Antonines there was a better state of things than existed in the era which we have chiefly considered

[1] Mihi, quanto plura recentium seu veterum revolvo, tanto magis ludibria rerum mortalium cunctis in negotiis observantur. Quippe fama, spe, veneratione, potius omnes destinabantur imperio, quam, quem futurum principem fortuna in occulto tenebat." Annal. iii. 18.

in this chapter. When we go back to an earlier period, to the age, for example, when Athens was in its glory, there is likewise presented a less revolting picture. And yet we must join in the verdict of a scholar, not wanting in catholicity of judgment, "that if the inner life had been presented to us of that period which in political greatness and art is the most brilliant epoch of humanity, we should have turned away from the sight with loathing and detestation. The greatest admirer of heathen writers, the man endowed with the finest sensibilities for beauty and form, would feel at once that there was a great gulf fixed between us and them, which no willingness to make allowance for the difference of ages and countries would enable us to pass."[1] This disparity between heathen and Christian society, it cannot be denied, is mainly due to the fact that under the one the objects of worship were the imperfect creatures of human fancy, and worship was itself largely sensuous, while under the other the objects of religious faith correspond to the true ideal of perfection, and worship rises to an unseen world.

[1] Professor Jowett, *Epp. of St. Paul*, p. 77.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE JEWS AT THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

On the eastern borders of the Roman empire, inhabiting a narrow strip of territory, dwelt a people who defied every attempt to break up their national feeling, and, in spite of a subjection to foreign domination, which had lasted for more than five hundred years, still confidently believed that they were the predestined conquerors and rulers of mankind. The germ of this great hope, which had grown into an absorbing, passionate expectation, antedated their existence as a nation. It lay in a divine purpose revealed to their progenitor, Abraham, that his posterity should be as the stars for multitude, and that from them a blessing should go forth to all other nations. Such was the prospect that was opened to the soul of the Patriarch, a faithful worshipper of the only true God, in the midst of the spreading idolatry. Of the Hebrew people, as of no other, was it true that, from the beginning of their career, religion was consciously the one end and aim of their being. That the true religion might both attain to its perfect development, and gather all mankind under its sway—this may be said to be the idea of their history. Their abode for several centuries in Egypt, following upon the nomadic life which they had previously led, brought them into contact with what was even then an ancient and civilized people. From the Egyptians they learned the mechanical arts; but from the

seductions of their religion the Hebrews were saved by the hostile relations that sprang up in consequence of the oppression with which they were treated. Moses, their deliverer, stands also at the head of the prophets, the interpreters of the will of God, who came forward from time to time, as the exigencies of an age might require, to give expression to whatever was deepest and holiest in the religious life of the people, and by impassioned rebuke, exhortation, and command, to purify their conduct and exalt their enthusiasm.

With the legislation of Moses, the Jewish commonwealth began. Now for the first time they became a political community. They were to stand under the special protection and guidance of God, who was not, however, a national God, in the narrow sense of heathenism, but the Supreme Creator and Ruler of the whole earth. Thus their religion was distinguished from every other ancient faith by being, of necessity, exclusive, and intolerant of dissent. They were to be witnesses for God, a nation of priests, set apart from other peoples by virtue of this relation, and by the unique polity under which they were to live. In keeping the divine law, they fulfilled their part, and acquired a title to the promises connected with obedience. This covenant between them and Jehovah was the *magna charta* of the Hebrew nation. For about 450 years, after entering Palestine, they lived in a kind of theocratic state, governed by judges, who arose in different places, and from time to time, under the impulse of a divine call to exercise the functions of leadership. Anarchy led to the popular demand for a monarchical system. Danger from foreign enemies called for a firmer political organization; and to this motive was added the consideration that while Samuel, the last and most eminent of the judges, had grown old, his sons were not worthy to succeed

to his power. Accordingly, in 1099 B. C., Saul was crowned king. The Theocracy, however, did not cease with this change. Side by side with the kings, stood the prophets to utter the divine will to ruler and subject, to curb and rebuke, as well as to stimulate and uphold the temporal power. Nor did the monarchy operate to quench the higher hopes of Israel.

Under David and Solomon the boundaries of the kingdom were carried to the Euphrates and the confines of Egypt. This vast extension of power seemed to foretoken the realization of the promise. Jerusalem, which had been conquered from the Canaanites by David, became, with its palace and temple, the centre of sacerdotal and regal splendor. But not one of the kings was the man demanded by the deepest purposes and aspirations that were latent in the religion of Jehovah. Hence, the Messianic hope, while it acquired a new definiteness through the type and precursor which the monarchy furnished, remained unfulfilled.[1] Moreover, the temporal grandeur of the kingdom, with the luxury and corruption that were incidental to it, menaced that pure religious development which was the heaven-appointed work of the nation. Solomon built the temple, and elevated the priesthood and worship of the Sanctuary. He excited, also, among the people a relish for wisdom, of which he was venerated as the founder and master, in all subsequent times.[2] His reign became, in after times, a symbol of earthly glory and riches. But his magnificence was costly, and involved the burdensome taxation of his subjects. His son, Rehoboam, arrogantly spurned the petitions for relief which were presented to him by the disaffected people; and the ten tribes north of Judea, partly for this reason, and partly from tribal jealousy and from a

[1] Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, iii. 12.
[2] Ewald, iii. 435.

continued attachment to the house of Saul, renounced their allegiance. The kingdom was thus divided forever. This was in 975 B. C. From this time, monarchy among the Hebrews approaches its dissolution. It rose to full vigor under the auspices of David; its era of splendor was the reign of Solomon; but its third and final period, though much longer than either of the others that preceded it, was one of decline. Israel, the northern division, fell a prey to Assyrian invasion. Samaria, the capital, was taken by Shalmaneser in 722 B. C., and a multitude of Israelites were deported from their country. In their room, heathen were introduced, and hence the Samaritans, being of mixed descent, as well as separated from the temple, were ever after counted as aliens and foes. Their position could not be more completely or concisely expressed than in the words of the Evangelist: "For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans."[1] Judea, nearly a century and a half later, followed the fate of Israel. In 588 B. C. Jerusalem was captured by Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and the principal inhabitants carried off into exile. This terrible catastrophe did not crush the faith and hope which had animated the Jewish heart through all preceding vicissitudes of the national history. Rather was it true that just in this era, before and during the Exile, the spirit of prophecy rose to its loftiest height. There was a faithful body who were inspired with the unconquerable conviction that the kingdom of God, now trampled in the dust, was imperishable, and that its adversaries would be broken in pieces.

The monarchy had fallen. It had given the people of God a name and fame among the nations. It had aided, in many ways, in the preservation and development of the national religion. Compare the Songs of Deborah with the

[1] John iv. 9.

Psalms of David.[1] But the monarchy embodied an element of force through which the religion could neither attain to its perfection in the conceptions and life of the people, nor diffuse itself abroad upon the earth. The civil unity of the nation was now broken in pieces. Nothing was left to them in their helplessness but to fall back upon the truths of that religion, and the succor of God. To no earthly power could they look for sympathy or help. Thus religion assumed its rightful supremacy as the one peculiar possession and glory of the people. The prophetic activity was left to exert itself with unimpeded power. Henceforward, the work of the nation could no longer be limited by its own borders. "Israel, after having once been thrown into the great stream of universal history, though only as a spiritual power, could never again withdraw from the midst of all the nations, and build for itself a close and strong kingdom similar to the other greater or smaller empires of the world."[2] But the religion had not yet ripened into its universal form, the prerequisite of its universal diffusion. A consciousness of this imperfection was attended with two results. First the yearnings of the people reached out with a new earnestness towards the Messiah of the future; and, secondly, the longing for a return to their own land, and to their life as a community there, held possession of their minds.

The fall of Babylon, in 536, brought to them deliverance. They had been usually treated more as colonists than captives; but, mingled as they were with the heathen, they were subject to strong temptations to compromise or give up their faith and observances. It was that part of the people which had sternly withstood these enticements, that chose to avail themselves of the permission of Cyrus to

[1] Ewald, *History*, iii. 58. (Engl. transl.)
[2] Ewald v. 36. (Engl. transl.)

return to their own land, and rebuild the sacred places. Their zeal for the law had been sharpened by the experiences of the exile. In them the mingled sentiments of religion and patriotism burned with intense ardor. There was really a sifting of the nation, for the number that remained were to those that returned to the old home and sanctuary as six to one. In the first caravan were 42,360, besides servants. Other bodies followed later, under Ezra, B. C. 458, and under Nehemiah, B. C. 445. The temple rose from its ruins, and the rites for which the devout had longed were restored in all their strictness.

The People of God were now once more a community, within the borders of their own land. But they were no longer independent. The restoration of the monarchical theocracy—the kingdom of David—was out of the question. Their religion had been preserved; to rescue and fortify this chief and characteristic possession had necessarily become the supreme object of pursuit. In reorganizing society, they fell back upon ancient laws, the primitive constitution, which formed the covenant with Jehovah, for the violation of which, as they deeply felt, these heavy penalties had fallen upon them. Everything favored the legal and ritualistic spirit. Under its influence, prophetic activity was repressed. After the Exile, ensued the government of the Hagiocracy. It availed to fortify the ancient faith against the inroads of heathenism. It invested as with a thick crust the spiritual life which it sought to protect. Yet in the long interval between the Return from Babylon and the Consummation through the appearance of the Messiah, while the nation was under a succession of foreign masters, not only did the body of religious doctrine expand itself, in many points legitimately, but the Gospel element, if one may so term it, was rife within the bosom of the community, and struggling to liberate itself

Jews restored not
independant
Mild rule Persian

Alexander 334-323 lot under
Greeks better Palestine prop
theater between Seleucids of Syria
& Ptolemies of Egypts
Jared fairly well under
Ptolemies till it fell
permanently under sway of
Syria little territory
bounded 3 sides by Gh cities

them; as if the contagion of perpetual intercourse with the heathen would infect their religious system to such a degree as to destroy its characteristic features. It was a new chapter in the long conflict with heathenism, which more than once seemed about to sweep away their creed and worship, or to sap their foundations. The foreign, Greek-speaking Jews, although, in the main, steadfast, interposed, on the whole, a less firm barrier in the way of heathen innovations. In Judea itself, there was a party lukewarm in its faith, and disposed to give way to the foreign influence. But these perils rendered the majority of the people the more immovable in their resistance, the more punctilious and rigid in their observance of the law, and the more zealously hostile to the pollutions of heathenism. The crisis came when Antiochus Epiphanes, embittered by his failures in conflict with Egypt, and with a despot's impatience at seeing any obstacle in the way of his capricious will, determined to break down the wall of separation between the Jews and the rest of his subjects, and to exterminate their worship. He so far succeeded that, in 168 B. C., he set up an altar of Jupiter—the "abomination of desolation"—in the temple, and even compelled the Jewish priests to immolate swine. Then occurred the Maccabean revolt. Mattathias, the father of the Asmonean family, of priestly descent, dwelling at the town of Modin, refused to take part in the idolatry required by the king, and, with his five sons, armed with cleavers, cut down the apostate Jew at the altar on which he was attempting to offer idolatrous sacrifice. Then followed a heroic contest with the whole power of Syria. "We fight," said Judas Maccabeus, "for our lives and our laws." "It is better for us," he said, "to die in battle than to behold the calamities of our people and our sanctuary. Nevertheless as the will of God is in heaven, so let Him

do."[1] Judas recovered the temple, but fell in battle, in 160 B. C., and all was, for the time, lost. Jonathan, his brother, took his place. He was seized treacherously, and murdered, in 143 B. C. Simon was the next champion from this family; and under him, after a long alternation of triumph and defeat, the victory was achieved, the Syrian yoke was cast off, and the Jews were free. Simon was made governor and high-priest, uniting thus in himself civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and this power was to descend in his family "until a faithful prophet should arise."[2] In 135 B. C., Simon was assassinated by his son-in-law Ptolemæus, who failed to profit by his crime. John Hyrkanus, the son of Simon, a vigorous prince, reigned until 105 B. C. From this time, civil and foreign wars, occasioned largely by the misdeeds, or inefficiency, of his degenerate descendants, weakened the land. In the year 78 B. C., by the death of Alexander Jannæus, the kingdom fell into the hands of his widow, Alexandra, called by the Jews, Salome, who made her eldest son, Hyrcan II., high priest. The contest between him, and his brother Aristobulus II., which broke out in open war, on the death of their mother (69 B. C.), cost the Jews their liberty. Hyrcan II., who had been prevailed on to abdicate, was put forward and supported by Antipater, a proselyte and prince of Idumea, which Hyrcan I. had annexed to Judea. Pompey, who was fresh from the conquest of Asia, gladly intervened to settle the strife. Judas Maccabeus had entered into an alliance with the Romans;[3] and the treaty, which had been signed by his envoys in the senate house, had been renewed with his successors. The subjugation of Asia Minor and of Syria could not fail to change the relation of the Jewish kingdom to the conquering empire, and

[1] 1 Macc. iii. 21, 59, 60.

[2] Macc. xiv. 41.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.*, xii. 10.

allies to subjects
Jerusalem attacked 12 ooo Jerusalem
Priests slaughtered at altars
Pompy & officers enter Holy of Holies

Herod king 30 BC Jerusalem taken
by him 3 yrs later. Antigonus
who had resisted Herod beheaded
Last of Asmonean Princes
Herod overcomes resistance of
Pharisees + fullmen of Antigonus
Surrender much to Cleopatra
died 4 BC year birth of X
Archelaus his son king Judea
10 yrs later Judea annexed to
Province of Syria under
procurators

Nature of Herod
king over 30 yrs

Able Cruel sensual ambitious
Several murders in own
family father in law wifes
grandfather brother in law

ney.[1] Then in a fit of jealous passion, he slew Mariamne herself, of whom he was ardently fond, and for whom, when the deed was done, he poured out frantic lamentations—where

> "Revenge is lost in agony
> And wild remorse to rage succeeding." [2]

Her mother Alexandra shared her fate. His sons by Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus, who had been educated at Rome, were the next victims; and, finally, Antipater, the son of Doris, his first wife, and one whose plots had brought on these tragedies, was himself ordered to execution.

Herod was a professed adherent of the Jewish religion. He rebuilt the old temple of Zerubbabel in a style of magnificence; and in order that no unconsecrated hands might be employed upon it, the structure was reared by a thousand priests, clad in white garments, who had been trained for the work.[3] He was careful not to outrage the sensibilities of the people to such a degree as to rouse them to a combined and desperate resistance. But they hated him and his government. He was not a Jew by descent, but an Idumean proselyte, whose profession of Judaism was a matter of policy, and not of conviction. He cringed before his Roman superiors, whose yoke rested heavily upon them. They saw the taxes which he wrung from them, lavishly expended upon objects identified with heathenism, or given to curry favor with his heathen patrons and masters. He even made contributions for the support of the Olympian games.[4] He built, at an enormous expense, Cæsarea upon the sea-coast, with its harbor, and its breakwater, composed of stones of an average length of fifty feet; and he adorned

[1] Joseph., *Antiq.*, xv. 3, 8.

[2] Byron's *Hebrew Melodies:* Herod's "*Lament for Mariamne.*" Joseph., *Antiq.*, xv. 9, *B. J.*, i. 22, 5.

[3] Joseph., xv. 11. 5, 6.

[4] Ibid., xvi. 5, 3.

this new and rival capital with a temple dedicated to Cæsar and to Rome, and conspicuous from afar to all who approached the coast.[1] He went so far as to build an amphitheatre in the Holy City itself, and to exhibit within it gladiatorial combats. He even erected a theatre for dramatic performances.[2] If his personal character was odious to the serious part of the nation, his half-disguised encouragement of Gentilism, of the detested ways of the heathen, and his maintenance of their usurped rule, were to the last extent loathsome.

The resistance to the flood of Gentile influences from every quarter centred in the Pharisees. Six thousand of them refused to take an oath of allegiance to Herod on his accession, but were put down with a strong hand.[3] Immediately after his death, Judas, the Galilean, whose party was a fanatical offshoot of Pharisaism, raised a revolt, which was crushed by the two legions of Varus, who crucified two thousand malcontents, besides capturing Sepphoris, the headquarters of Judas, and selling its inhabitants into slavery.[4] Out of this movement sprang the Zealots, by whom the flame of resistance was fanned, until it broke out in the last great and fatal conflict with Rome, ending in the capture of Jerusalem, and the destruction of the temple, by Titus.

But, independently of various efforts at armed insurrection, the Pharisees interposed a continuous moral resistance to the agencies at war with the liberty and religion of the Jews. They are to be considered in contrast with the Sadducees, with whom their name is so frequently coupled. Neither were sects in the proper sense of the term,[5] although they are so designated by Josephus, who wished to make

[1] Joseph., *Antiq.*, xv. 9, 6.
[2] Ibid., xv. 8, 1.
[3] Joseph., *Antiq.* xvii. 2, 4.
[4] Ibid., *B. J.*, ii. 5.
[5] See Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii. 87; Schürer, p. 425.

Phar leaders & authoritative teachers

Trim - Exile. Puritans

Phar - common people

Sad fear nobles high priests
not patriotic

Sad letter of Law - Jurors

sure, which the Mosaic laws appointed. There must be "an eye for an eye."[1] The Pharisees, on the contrary, were bent, to use their own phrase, upon "building a hedge about the law," by defining its demands with reference to every situation and circumstance of life. They would shut out heathen contamination by covering, as it were, the whole life with a net-work of rules. Where the Old Testament statutes were silent, where they were capable of a double interpretation, where new questions might arise from the altered condition of society, the Pharisees came in with their precise expositions and precepts. These were the traditions of the elders, the supplementary laws, constituting a copious, unwritten code, which was transmitted orally, and which, it was at length claimed, emanated from Moses himself.[2] As high, and even higher authority was attributed to this code than to the written law itself. One could do nothing, and avoid nothing, which was not somehow touched by the law in its endless ramifications. Especially were the externals of worship, both public and private, the subject of the most elaborate and minute definition.

There was a noble side to this prevalent legalism, regarded as a grand attempt, in the face of adverse influences of the most powerful and varied character, to uphold the religion of the Old Testament, the religion of Moses and the prophets, the revealed faith, against the inroads of idolatry and the corrupting influences of Gentile worship and culture. When Pilate caused the garrison of Jerusalem to bring in by night the Roman standards, with small images of the Emperor upon them, the people flocked to Cæsarea in a mass, and for five days and nights besought the Procu-

[1] For other examples, see Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, i. 121.

[2] On the transmission of traditions, see Lutterbeck, *Die Neutestamentl. Lehrbegriffe*, i. 171.

rator to withdraw this abomination from the holy place. On the sixth day, when Pilate caused the people to be surrounded by his soldiers with drawn swords, the multitude bared their necks, and declared that they preferred to die rather than behold the violation of their law. Pilate gave the required order for the removal of the images.[1] This is only one of a multitude of examples of a devotion to their religion, which led the Jews to brave all terrors, and which might at the end, if they had possessed military leaders of competent skill, have rendered them invincible to Roman arms. Pharisaism had its worthy side, and its good men: Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, Gamaliel were Pharisees.[2] But, under their auspices, religion was resolved into law—a law which, with its numberless and meddlesome injunctions became a burdensome yoke. Upon the single topic of the observance of the Sabbath, there were thirty-nine general rubrics, under each of which were numerous subordinate precepts, each with specified exceptions, and all together forming of themselves an extensive code. For example, it was forbidden to tie and untie knots, but there were certain exceptions, and what these were must be stated: for instance, a woman might tie the knots requisite for fastening her dress. With respect to fasting, lustrations, and the whole rubric of ceremonial purity, there was no end to the commandments which every pious Jew was required by the Pharisees rigidly to obey. Inward piety was well-nigh smothered under the vast weight of ritual practices, often mechanical in their nature, and performed from a blind subservience to a statutory requirement. Hence formalism belonged to the essence of the Pharisaic religion. Hypocrisy could not

[1] The insurgents under the Maccabees at first refused to resist their enemies on the Sabbath: 1 Maccabees ii. 32 seq. Plutarch refers to this incident as illustrative of the folly of superstition. *De Superstit.* 8.

[2] For exaggerated praise of the Pharisees, see Grätz, iii. 76.

was farming; they had among them artisans also, but abjured trade and commerce. Simple in their habits, they set a high value upon quietness of spirit and the government of the passions. They discarded slavery and oaths, were sticklers for ceremonial purity, were accustomed to bathe in cold water before meals, and frequently on other occasions—even if one of them touched a companion of an inferior degree or class,—preferred white linen clothing, the apparel of priests, lived in celibacy generally, if not altogether,[1] probably abstained from meat and wine, and sent gifts to the temple, but offered no sacrifices. According to Josephus, they believed in fate; that is, in unconditional Providence. They reverenced the law, and the Scriptures which, like other Jews, they read and expounded in worship; although it is difficult to tell how they reconciled their omission of sacrifices with the Scriptural requirements. They had priests of their own, independent of the Levitical priesthood. They were quite rigid in observing the Sabbath and they punished blasphemy with death. They believed in the immortality of the soul, but not in the continuance or resurrection of the body. Such, at least, is the representation of Josephus. Good souls, they held, have a peaceful life, beyond the ocean, where there is neither rain, snow, nor heat. Evil souls are banished to a cold and dark corner where they suffer unspeakable torments. The Essenes believed that the spirit of prophecy continued among them, and individuals became conspicuous for their gift of prophetic powers. They were honored as sooth-

[1] Josephus (*B. J.* ii. 8, 13,) describes a class of Essenes who marry. Philo (*opp.* ed. Mangey, ii. 633, 634) says that some of the Essenes marry. So Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* v. 17), who says that they are recruited by those who fly to them from the tempest of fortune and the miseries of life. Compare Schürer, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, p. 607. The fact is, probably, that in the stricter colonies women were not admitted. See Hausrath, i. 137.

sayers, or fortune-tellers. Besides the dualism that crops out in several features of Essenism, we find among them the custom of invoking the sun at the dawn of day,—possibly as representing the effulgence of God. Their principal non-Judaic peculiarities were aversion to marriage, abstinence from sacrifices, and the homage paid to the sun. There has been much speculation as to the origin of these features of Essenism, which are so at variance with Hebrew feeling, and with Old Testament law, which in various other points was so strictly observed. It is probable that some of the peculiarities were due to an oriental influence proceeding from the Medo-Persian, or Zoroastrian religion. The theory of a Buddhistic influence upon them is improbable. Some writers, including Zeller, find traces of a Pythagorean influence, through the Greeks;[1] but this view, to say the least, is doubtful. With strong points of resemblance to Pharisaism, they differed in their dualistic tendency, and in discarding sacrifices. Ewald considers that they, like the Pharisees, sprang from the *Chasidim*—the party, in the Maccabean times, conspicuous for their zeal for purity.[2] Thus, if not a branch of the Pharisaic movement, both grew from the same root. The conscience of the people, says Ewald, withdrew, as it were, into the wilderness to escape from contact with pollution and wickedness. The Essenes were noted for their kindness to the poor and the sick. They were supposed to be familiar with the healing virtues of plants. In later times, they were admired by the heathen, by Pliny, for example, more than any other Jews. In the age when Christ appeared, they stood aloof from the current of events, and exerted no perceptible influence upon public affairs. This accounts for the fact that they are not mentioned in the New Testament. There is no reason to suppose that John the Bap-

[1] Phil. d. Griechen, iii. 589 seq.

[2] *Gesch.*, iii. 483 seq.

of the vast amount of matter which entered into the Talmudic literature. To the Scribes belonged the right to "bind and loose;" that is, the power to expand and apply the law —a kind of legislative function. When the pupil became qualified to teach, he took his seat at the side of the Rabbi; but before he could conduct a school for himself he must go through a form of ordination in which, as a part of the ceremony, he was presented by the Rabbi with a key, to signify that he was now empowered to expound the word for himself.[1] The Rabbis taught without pay. They were revered, and saluted with reverence; the honor felt for the law was shared by its learned interpreters.[2] As the knowledge of the law was the whole erudition of the Hebrew, men might enter upon this study from any occupation, and at any age. There was nothing anomalous in the calling of Matthew from the receipt of customs, and Simon and Andrew from their nets.[3]

The great schools for the nation at large were the synagogues, which arose soon after the exile, and were found in every place of any consideration throughout Palestine. There were 480 in Jerusalem alone. It is probable that the smallest place had at least one synagogue. In these edifices, plain in their structure, of a rectangular form, the ark containing the law and other Scriptures was kept; and here the people, seated according to age, with the sexes apart, were assembled every Sabbath, and, also, on two other days of the week—market-days,—the service on these last occasions being briefer. The synagogue was under the charge of "elders," whose president, if such an officer existed, was only *primus inter pares*. (Mark v. 22; Acts xiii. 15, xviii. 8, 17.) In truth, either of the

[1] This gives occasion for the language of Jesus, Matt. xvi. 19.
[2] Matt. xxiii. 7.
[3] See Hausrath, i. p. 78.

Elders might be termed a "Ruler."[1] There was a "minister,"[2] or servant, who performed such duties as that of taking the roll from the hands of the Rabbi. There were officers for collecting and distributing alms. An offending member might be cast out, or cut off, from the synagogue. There was a person appointed by the congregation, and representing them, who read prayers, to which the people responded "Amen;" but he was not, it would seem, a permanent officer. The Hebrew had given place to the Aramaic dialect, so that the law and the prophets, after being read, in select portions, in the original, were interpreted. The reading was attended by an exposition. The order of the service was as follows: it opened with prayer, and the reciting of selected portions of the Thorah, or Law, in which were contained in brief the great articles of Faith. Then followed the set forms of Prayer, some of which have probably survived to the present time in Jewish worship. Then came the regular reading of the Law and Prophets, with the interpretation and discourse that attended it; the whole concluding with prayer or benediction. The teaching and learning of the law was the prime object of the service. It was mainly by the agency of the synagogue that the Jews were kept familiar with the law. The whole Pentateuch was so divided as to be read in a cycle of one, or of three, years. The reader, who might be any member of the congregation, stood; but whoever gave the sermon, in connection with it, sat. The discussions in and about the synagogues at the close of the service were earnest and animated. While other nations were immersed in worldly concerns, in trade and commerce, or in the hot pursuit of power or sensual pleasure, it is surely an interesting spectacle to behold this

[1] See Prof. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 205 n. 1.

[2] ὑπηρετής, Luke iv. 20.

one people, from the oldest to the youngest, absorbed in this work of investigating the law and imprinting it upon their memories.

The Great Council—the Supreme Court—of the nation was the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. It consisted of seventy-one members, who were priests, elders, or men of age and reputed wisdom, and scribes, over whom usually presided the high-priest. They met after the morning sacrifice, commonly in an apartment contiguous to the temple. They sat in a semi-circle, with the President in the centre, behind whom, and facing the members, on rows of benches, were the pupils of the Rabbis, who were present to listen to the debates, and witness the proceedings.[1] The great Sanhedrim was a judicial body, taking cognizance of all questions relating to the theocratical law; for example, marriages, divorces, the forms of contracts, orthodoxy of opinion, and infractions of the Mosaic statutes, of every kind, as well as of the common law embodied in traditions. The Romans took away from this tribunal the power of inflicting capital punishment. Its jurisdiction stretched over the whole land. We find Herod, in the early part of his career, summoned before the Sanhedrim for executing a brigand in Galilee, without its permission. Below this principal Senate, there existed in every considerable town, a local court, composed, in part at least, of Levites, and at which the Scribes assisted—the judges being seven in number. Before this minor tribunal all ordinary cases were brought. Only cases where the interpretation of the law might be doubtful were relegated to the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, the court of appeals. The sessions of these local courts were held in the synagogues. Their sentences were carried out, if practicable, on the spot. Thirty-nine stripes were laid upon

[1] The High-Priest generally presided. Joseph., *Antiq.*, xx., ix. 1; Acts iv. 23.

the offender, one being subtracted from forty, in order that this legal limit might not, through an accident in counting, be exceeded.[1]

The Rabbis were not perfectly agreed in their teaching. Schools of opinion arose, differing from one another on a variety of points, mostly pertaining to the ritual. Of these the most famous were the parties of Hillel and of Schammai, the former of whom was characterized by a more liberal, and the latter by a rigorous construction of the Judaic statutes.

Of the current Jewish theology, the tenets that constitute orthodoxy, we have now to speak. The canon of the Old Testament was of gradual formation. The first and second divisions, the Law and the Prophets, were first closed, and afterwards the third division, called "the Psalms," was made up. From the statement of Josephus, coupled with the testimony of Origen and Jerome, there is scarcely any room to doubt that the authoritative canon among the Jews in the time of Christ coincided with our present canon of the Old Testament. The apocryphal books, which were connected with the Septuagint translation, either written in Greek, or whose Hebrew originals were wanting, were not recognized by the Palestinian Jews. By the side of the canonical books, whose inspiration and normal authority were admitted, the Rabbis placed tradition as a collateral source of religious knowledge. The fundamental principles of Mosaic and prophetic Judaism were maintained. The gods of the heathen were regarded from two points of view; now as nothing, as wholly creations of fancy, and now as having a real being but as inferior to Jehovah, and unable to withstand His power. The doctrine of angels, both good and evil,

[1] Matt. x. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 24.

forms a conspicuous feature of the later Jewish theology.[1] The good angels were conceived of as a host, as divided into orders and ranks, the principal angelic beings having, each of them, names. They were the agents of Providence in the government of the world; by them the law was given on Mount Sinai. They were the messengers of God; they exercised a guardianship over the righteous. Yet they were not objects of religious worship, or invocation. They filled up the void, as it were, between Jehovah and the world, but they diverted to themselves none of the homage that belonged to Him. The doctrine of evil angels, or demons, and their mischievous agency, was equally prominent. Demoniacal possessions, and ceremonies of exorcism, were phenomena of daily occurrence. It may be granted that the current Jewish doctrine of angels and Satanic beings was stimulated in its development by the influence of the Zoroastrian creed, with which the Jews came in contact during the exile; yet the essential elements of this doctrine are of an earlier date, and find their warrant within the circle of their own revelation. All dualistic ideas which made sin, and the continuance of sin, a part of the necessary order of things, and shut out the personal agency of the creature, were excluded. "In theory, and in the minds of really pious men, monotheism remained inviolate; God's direction of all things was not limited by the operations of the wicked spirits; therefore they were always subject to Him."[2]

The problem of physical evil, and especially that aspect of the problem which deals with the sufferings endured by the righteous, agitated the Jewish mind, but found no complete solution. The feeling that a conspicuous sufferer must be a flagrant transgressor, that peculiar calamities imply

[1] See Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 352–424.

[2] Kuenen, the *Religion of Israel*, iii. 41.

peculiar guilt, if not in him, at least in a parent, was prevalent. Yet the Jews were not unfamiliar with the idea that even the good may be objects of divine chastisement. With reference to the future life, the prevailing Old Testament representation of *Sheol*, or the underworld, the abode of the dead, is hardly less sombre than the heathen conception of Hades. The language in Job on this topic is as gloomy as that of Homer. Sheol is an abode of darkness, of feeble life, if there be life there at all. As we advance in the Old Testament, we meet with brighter views. This is the case in some of the Psalms. The passage in Job, beginning, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," is of too doubtful reference to be placed in this category. At the time of the birth of Jesus, the Jews, with the exception of the Sadducees, universally believed in the immortality of the soul. This article of faith was—if we except the Essenes, and the adherents of the Alexandrian Jewish philosophy of Philo—indissolubly connected in their minds with the belief in the resurrection of the body. Josephus attributes to the Pharisees the belief in the resurrection of the righteous only. But in the book of Daniel, which was a part of the authoritative canon, and contributed much to shape the prevailing conceptions on these topics, the resurrection of both the good and the evil is unambiguously declared.[1] On subordinate points connected with the doctrine of resurrection, however, there were wide diversities of opinion.

There was one great expectation common to all earnest Jews, the expectation of the Messiah. The Old Testament religion was prophetic in its whole nature. The guides of the Hebrew people were ever pointing to the future. There, and not in the past, lay the golden age. The Jew

[1] Daniel xii. 2.

might revert with pride to the victories of David, and the splendor of Solomon, but these vanished glories only served to remind him of the lofty destiny in store for his nation, and to inspire his imagination to picture the day when the ideal of the kingdom should be realized, and the whole earth be submissive to the monarch upon Zion. An expectation which was latent in the very nature of the theocratic kingdom, and which found utterance, in a form more or less vague, in the early Scriptures, more and more assumed a concrete expression; and the hopes of all patriotic and devout Jews centred upon a personage who was to appear upon the earth, and take in his hands the sceptre of universal dominion. The particular form which this hope took, might vary with the changing condition of the people, and the sort of calamities that weighed upon them. The imagery under which the Messianic era was depicted, or shadowed forth, might vary with the point of view of the writer, and might be cast in a mould corresponding to the limitations of his position. During the Maccabean age, when the struggle for liberty filled the nation with enthusiasm, and when another family than that of David was leading it forward to victory, it was natural that the Messianic hope should slumber. Yet it was never extinguished: it was like a fire under the ashes. The first book of Maccabees contains no distinctly Messianic prediction; yet it refers to the trustworthy prophet who is to arise, and to supersede the Asmonean family. The old expectation, in certain grand outlines, was still a tenant of the Jewish mind. Whether the book of Daniel is a product of the Maccabean era, or has an earlier date, is immaterial as concerns the present point. It is enough that the prediction of the Messianic kingdom which it contained, was familiar to the Jews, and one upon which they rested. After a description of the four kingdoms, the last of which, the

Roman, "as iron, breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things," the writer says, that in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed.[1]

In the Apocryphal books, the *Assumptio Mosis*, and the *Book of the Jubilees*, which were written about the beginning of the Christian era, the Messianic predictions are prominent. In the Sibylline Books, the Book of Enoch, (near the end of the second century, B. C.), and the Psalter of Solomon (not far from 60 B. C.), the Messiah is personal. In the Book of Enoch, he is designated as the Son of Man, by which one individual is meant, whatever question may be raised as to the primary sense of this phrase in the Book of Daniel. The New Testament, were there no other source of knowledge on the subject, shows how deeply and widely the yearning for the Messiah had taken hold of the hearts of the people. The calamities of the Herodian age, the double yoke under which the nation groaned, intensified the longing for the Deliverer, which assumed a form varying with the temper and spirit of those who cherished it.

There are certain features of the Messianic expectation cherished at that time by the Jews, which may here be set down. The Messiah was to establish his kingdom in a time of general distress and calamity. Nature herself was to bear witness, by miraculous, terrible phenomena, such as the hiding of the sun and moon in darkness, and the brandishing of swords in the sky, to the impending crisis. The Son of Man, the title given to the Messiah in the Book of Enoch, and derived from the Book of Daniel, was to be preceded by the reappearance of the stern and solemn prophet, Elijah, upon the earth. Then the Messiah

[1] Daniel ii. 44.

Himself, the Anointed One, endued with special gifts and powers from God, would arise. The heathen powers would unite in a common onset upon Him, but would be crushed by His power. Jerusalem would be renovated and adorned with beauty; the Diaspora, the Jews who were abroad, would be brought back; and a glorious kingdom, having its centre and capital in Palestine, but embracing under it all mankind, would be erected. It was to be a time of joy and plenty, an era, also, of holiness and peace. In this form, according to many, the kingdom was to continue forever. But it was considered by many to be of limited duration, and to be introductory to a great change —a renewal of the heavens and the earth, which the Messianic kingdom was to usher in. Thus a distinction was made between "this world" (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος) and "the world to come." By some the great revolution was expected to take place at the very commencement of the Messianic reign; others put it later as the ultimate issue. At this point, the general resurrection was to occur, the last judgment, and the eternal award of happiness or misery. Prior to the general judgment, the abode of the departed was in Hades, the righteous being in Paradise, but separated from the wicked, who suffered torments, the prelude of the final penalty to follow the ultimate verdict of the Judge.

As to the person of the Messiah, the Jews after the Christian era considered that he was to be a mere man.[1] In the times that immediately preceded the birth of Jesus, it is certain that pre-existence was frequently ascribed to the Christ. This is clear from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, and the Fourth Book of Ezra. He was chosen, and hidden with God, before the world was made.[2] His glory is from everlasting to everlasting. The pre-existence and supernatural character of the Messiah were involved

[1] Justin, *Dial. c. Trypho*, c. 49.

[2] Enoch, 48. 6.

in the accepted interpretation of the Book of Daniel. There is ground to conclude that, in the period referred to, there was a widely diffused conception of the Messiah as already existing, withdrawn from sight, in the heavens, and destined to appear visibly as man, endowed with supernatural gifts and qualities, a Ruler of spotless righteousness.[1]

The Talmudic writings admit the conception of sufferings as falling to the lot of the Messiah, and apply to him predictions of this character in the Prophets. But within the covers of the New Testament, there is no trace of any such expectation among the contemporaries of Jesus.[2] Nor do the other writings of that period afford any proof that such an idea was cherished.[3] The galling yoke of heathen rule to which the Jews were subject, the wide-spread spirit of legalism, and their moral condition in general, led them to yearn for a political Messiah. They fastened upon the prophetic imagery which fell in with their predilection, construed it as a literal description, and not as a poetic anticipation, and they passed by everything else of a different purport. Even the humble, and those who aspired after emancipation from sin, could not divest their minds of the idea that the Messiah was, literally speaking, to sit on the throne of David. John the Baptist, in the prison in which he had been immured by Herod Antipas, was perplexed by the fact that Jesus took a course so dissonant from the universal expectation, from which he appears not to have been wholly free. He sent his disciples with the inquiry: "Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?"[4]

[1] See Ewald, *Geschichte*, v. 68 seq.

[2] John i. 29 is a possible exception to this remark. See below, p. 429.

[3] See Schürer, p. 597 seq.

[4] Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19, 20. See below, p. 430.

We must not forget that there was a Judaism out of Palestine, which, if it affected the currents of Gentile thought, might also in turn be tinctured by them. It was at Alexandria, under the peculiar influences that belonged to that great meeting-place of the nations, that Jewish thought underwent the most serious modifications. There the Septuagint version was framed, the Bible of Greek-speaking Christians as well as Jews, down to the end of the first age of Christianity. There the canon took up those books, only one of which, Ecclesiasticus, is known to have been written in Hebrew, which are now commonly known under the name of Apocrypha, and which the Palestinian canon excluded. To commend the Alexandrian theology to the Jews of Palestine, "the Wisdom of Solomon" was written; just as the Book just named, "the Son of Sirach," sought to recommend the Palestinian doctrine to the Jews of Alexandria.[1]

Philo, the principal teacher of the Jewish philosophy that sprang up at Alexandria, was an old man in the year 40, when he headed a deputation of Jews to the Emperor Caligula. His birth must have occurred, therefore, not far from 20 B. C. His system is an amalgamation of Greek philosophy with the Old Testament theology; a combination of Plato and Moses, the tenets of whom he considered to be, in many points, identical.[2] The Greek sages, he held, were borrowers from the Hebrew teaching. This agreement he effected by the flexible method of allegorical interpretation, his theory being that an occult sense, open to the discerning, underlies the literal and historical meaning of the Scriptures, and is to be accepted in connection

[1] See Stanley, *Hist. of the Jewish Ch.*, iii. 296.

[2] For the literature upon Philo, see Schürer, p. 619, Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.* i. 225, Dorner, *Gesch. d. Lehre v. d. Person Christi*, i. 22, Lipsius, Art., *Alexandr. Religionsphil.*; in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon.*

with it. Philo, like Plato, held that matter in its chaotic form is eternal, and that creation impresses upon it the pre-existing ideas, the patterns before the divine mind, through which the formless stuff of the world is turned into a cosmos. God is far above all contact with the world; He is the ineffable One, whose very attributes are an anthropomorphic conception. Between God Himself and the world, and intermediate between them, are the Powers, the instruments of divine agency and communication with the creation. Above them, and embracing them in some way, is the Logos, first immanent in God as the divine reason, and then emerging into emanent existence; in whom is the plan of the world, and through whom that plan is actualized in the cosmos. The Logos is the mediator between the absolute Deity, and created existences, bridging over this otherwise impassable gulf. He is the Son of God, the Archangel, the Paraclete.[1] The body perishes forever, but the soul is immortal. A vein of dualism, caught from the Greek schools, runs through the system of Philo, and taints his ethical doctrine. He shares only in a vague and general way in the Messianic expectation of his countrymen. The heathen, he thinks, will eventually be struck with shame at having presumed to exercise government over the Hebrews, their superiors in wisdom. The acme of devotional attainment is when the soul, in a kind of ecstasy holds communion with the Supreme Essence, without the mediating intervention of the Logos. Those gifted with this intuition, and rising to this exalted fellowship, are "the children of the father." Philo has no thought of an incarnation of the Logos. The Messiah is to be a

[1] It is a controverted point whether the Logos of Philo is a personification, or a person. The latter view is held by Dähne, Gfrörer, Semisch, Lücke, Ritter, and others. The reasons against it are given by Dorner, i., 22 n. 12, and by Lipsius, in the Article referred to above.

human personage. It should be observed that notwithstanding the Platonic influence, Philo found a point of connection and a foundation for his speculations relative to the Logos, in the bold and striking personifications of Wisdom in the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, and in the Son of Sirach—personifications which approach the character of actual personality. The ideas of the Philonic school were widely diffused. Doubtless they were known in Judea, but they would be regarded with no favor by the austere guides of the people; nor is it possible that they could have penetrated to Nazareth, or within the humble circle of disciples which Jesus gathered about Him.

From the pages of Josephus and from the New Testament, one may derive a vivid picture of Palestine in the days of Jesus. Galilee, on the north, where His childhood and youth were passed, and the scene of a great part of His public labors, was a fertile and beautiful region. Especially was the lower part, lying westward of the lake, famed for its beauty, and for the rich variety of fruits and flowers that grew upon its soil. Josephus, in his autobiography, states that Galilee contained two hundred and forty cities and villages; and, in his History of the Jewish War, he says that every village contained at least fifteen thousand people.[1] Making all proper subtraction from this exaggerated estimate, we yet know that over this district was spread a dense, busy population. Somewhat less rigid than their orthodox brethren and the magnates of the nation at Judea, they were spoken of by the latter slightingly. Their intercourse with the heathen, partly in consequence of the fact that the great road for caravans between Damascus and Ptolemais passed through their land, exposed them to censure and suspicion. But the

[1] Vita, 45; B. J. III. iii. 2.

Galileans were ardent patriots; and their indomitable valor is lauded by Josephus.

Between Galilee and Jerusalem, unless the traveller took a circuitous route, was hated Samaria. Its inhabitants, denied the privilege of taking part in the rebuilding of the temple and in the national worship, after the Babylonian exile, did all that they could to frustrate the exertions of the Judean colonists. At length they erected on Mount Gerizim a temple of their own, and Manasseh, a Jewish priest, took charge of the services. This inflamed still more the mutual hostility of the neighboring peoples. "There be two manner of nations," says the Son of Sirach, "which my heart abhorreth; and the third is no nation: they that sit upon the mountain of Samaria [Mt. Seir], and they that dwell among the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwell in Sichem."[1] At length Hyrcanus razed the temple to the ground. The Samaritans still held to the law, and to the books of the Pentateuch, and looked for a Messiah who should be on their side, as it were, and confer honor on the mountain where they worshipped. They gave their sympathy, first, to the Syrian oppressors of Judea, and then to the Romans, whose subjugation of their Southern neighbors they beheld with pleasure.

The strong-hold of the Jewish nation was in Judea itself. There was the seat of theocratical authority. There was the sanctuary to which all pious Jews, from Rome to Babylon, sent up their gifts, and whither they streamed in countless multitudes to the great festivals.

No one can read Josephus without being profoundly impressed with the distracted condition of society, the confusion and distress, the passion and crime, that darkened the whole land of the Jews in the closing period of Herod's

[1] Son of Sirach, i. 25, 26.

reign. The people were held down by the overmastering strength of the Romans, and by the grim fortresses which the tyrant had erected in different places, to keep the discontented populace in subjection. When we turn from this troubled scene to the evangelical narratives, it is like beholding a star in the darkest night.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FIRST EVANGELICAL RECORDS: THE GOSPELS OF MARK AND MATTHEW.

It is an interesting question whether the Apostle Paul made use of written memorials of the life of Jesus, either in the form of a record of events, or of discourses. That he would need and desire records of this character, is in the highest degree probable. He wrote the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, A. D. 53; and within the next ten years all the rest of his writings, with the possible exception of the Pastoral Epistles, were composed.[1] These epistles contain invaluable testimony to events in the history of Jesus. But they also cite His words. This is done with explicit formality in 1 Cor. xi. 23–25, where are given the words of Christ at the institution of the Lord's Supper; which, as the language of Paul implies, came to him mediately. There is every reason to suppose that his authority was one of the first disciples.[2] In one of the discourses of Paul, which is reported by Luke,[3] a saying of Jesus is cited, which the Evangelist, be it observed,

[1] Baur conceded the genuineness of the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the Romans, and Galatians. Hilgenfeld adds to the list I. Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon. *Einl. in d. N. T.*, pp. 239, 331, 333. On the genuineness of the other Pauline Epistles, see *Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christ.*, pp. 274, 275.

[2] See Neander, *Corintherbriefe*, p. 182, *Leben Jesu*, p. 10; *Plant. and Train. of the Ch.* (Robinson's ed.), p. 107.

[3] Acts xx. 35.

had not included in his Gospel. Scattered through the epistles of Paul, there are numerous evident allusions to utterances of Jesus. All things considered, the probability is decidedly in favor of a use by Paul of a writing which included at least important portions of the teachings of the Lord.

Whether any memoranda of His teachings, or incidents in His ministry, were made during His life-time by any of those who heard Him, is doubtful. There is no evidence to warrant us in saying with confidence that records of this kind were then made. The oldest written Gospels of which we are possessed are unquestionably the first three. The title "Gospel" is a synonym of the Good Tidings of Salvation, by which the prophecies were fulfilled, or the history of Jesus during His life on earth. The specifications "according to Matthew," "according to Mark," "according to Luke," refer the several narratives to these sources respectively. This would not necessarily imply that these persons were themselves the authors of the books respectively, yet such in all probability is what in the case of these titles is meant.[1]

These three are styled the Synoptical Gospels in consequence of their affinities to one another, and their common distinction from John. They rest upon a common basis; they are branches of one stock.[2]

This resemblance exists with regard to the disposition of matter.[3] The first and third Gospels begin with the period anterior to the appearance of John the Baptist. Here, at the point where the preaching of John begins, they are joined by Mark. Then follows, in all three, the Baptism

[1] See Bleek, *Einl. in d. N. T.* (Mangold's ed.) § 38.

[2] De Wette, *Einl. in d. N. T.* § 77.

[3] See Holtzmann, *Die Synoptisch. Evangg.* § 2 (p. 10, seq.) De Wette, *Einl.* § 79, a.

and Temptation, the public Teaching of Jesus in Galilee, and the Journey to Jerusalem—under which head Luke introduces a considerable amount of matter not contained in the other two. Then all describe the entry into Jerusalem, the Last Supper, and the Betrayal, Death, and Resurrection of the Lord. In all of them the history is presented, not in a continuous flow, but in a series of numerous brief narratives or sections, linked together. Of the numerous instances of the sick healed by Jesus, the three Evangelists select the same; and a like agreement is found with regard to the teachings of Jesus, although He uttered so much that is recorded by neither. Matthew and Luke record the woe pronounced over Chorazin and Bethsaida (Matt. xi. 21–24; Luke x. 13–15), but neither reports "the mighty works" to which the Saviour's words refer.[1] The Synoptists connect together in the same manner separate narratives; for example, the selections relating to the Baptism, Temptation, and Return to Galilee; the Storm upon the Lake, and the Gadarenes; the Plucking of the Ears of Corn, and the Healing of the Withered Hand; the Confession of Peter, and the Prophecy of the Passion; the Healing of the Blind at Jericho, and the Entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem.

But the problems presented for solution cannot be understood without taking into view the extent of verbal agreement in the three narratives, and without considering the differences in connection with the correspondences that are found to exist. The coincidence is in fragments, interrupted by dissimilar ideas and facts.[2] It is the variations both in language and detail, occurring often in the midst of close correspondences in both particulars, that occasion perplexity, and render the questions suggested by the phe-

[1] Holtzmann, p. 11.

[2] See Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, I., Note D., p. cxi.

nomena among the most curious and difficult ever offered for literary criticism.

1. Sometimes there is an exact verbal agreement in all three. "Prepare the way of the Lord: make His paths straight," is a passage identically the same in all, although it differs in form both from the Hebrew and from the Septuagint,—the Greek version used by the New Testament writers (Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 3; Luke iii. 4). This is one of many examples.

2. This verbal identity is found in cases where the terms and constructions are peculiar.

Matt. xvi. 28.	Mark ix. 21.	Luke ix. 27.
—"There be some standing here that shall not taste of death till they see," etc.	—"There be some of them that stand here which shall not taste of death till they see," etc.	—"There be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see," etc.

Here, with slight verbal deviations in the original, all have the same peculiar phrase—"shall not taste of death," (*οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου*). In the passage (Matt. ix. 15, Mark ii. 20, Luke v. 35), "when the bridegroom shall be taken away," there is the same peculiar term (*ἀπαρθῇ*) in all. Not a few unusual terms, or collocations of terms, are common to the three Evangelists.[1]

3. Verbal coincidences are principally in the report of Christ's words, or of the words of others, and are comparatively unfrequent in the connected narratives. This is a phenomenon which has an important bearing on the question of the origin and mutual relation of the Synoptists. In passages common to all three, one-sixth of the matter consists in verbal coincidences; and of these one-fifth is in the narrative portion, and four-fifths in the recitative parts. Of the coincident matter common to Matthew and Mark,

[1] For other illustrations under this head, see Holtzmann, p. 12.

five-sixths is found in the recitative passages. In the matter common to Matthew and Luke exclusively, and in that common to Mark and Luke exclusively, there are, with two important exceptions, no verbal coincidences except in the recitative portions.[1] As might be expected from these statements, there is a marked difference of style between the narrative parts, and the reports of what is said—the recitative parts—in the Synoptical Gospels.

4. The quotations from the Old Testament which are found in these Gospels may throw some light upon the problems before us. One fact is that the citations which are common to all three are from the Septuagint; in the very few instances where these quotations vary from the Septuagint form, the same variations are found in all. Another fact is that in Matthew, nearly all the quotations in the "pragmatic" part of the Gospel — the passages which begin with "in order that it might be fulfilled" (ἵνα πληρωθῇ); passages which consist of the Evangelist's own comments or reflections—are founded upon the Hebrew text, although almost every one of them shows also the influence of the Septuagint. They are from the Septuagint, but are modified by regard to the Hebrew original. On the contrary, in the remaining portions of Matthew, the Old Testament quotations are drawn wholly from the Septuagint.[2] In Mark, the passage in i. 2, which embodies a reflection of the Evangelist, is from the Hebrew. The passage in xv. 28, which is from the Septuagint, is expunged from the text by Tischendorf: it was introduced into the manuscripts from Luke. So that in the only instance of the kind in Mark (i. 2), the same rule

[1] These calculations are by Norton, Vol. I., Note D. See also Westcott, *Introd. to the Gospels*, p. 203.

[2] Holtzmann, pp. 13, 259.

holds as in Matthew. All of Luke's citations, with a single exception, are from the Septuagint.[1]

5. The hypothesis of a primitive written Gospel which furnished to each of the Evangelists the matter which is common to all of them, each being supposed to write independently of the others, is at present regarded with little favor. According to this hypothesis, a Gospel was early written in the Aramaic, the current dialect of Palestine, and soon translated into Greek. This Gospel furnished Apostles and preachers with a kind of manual for their own use and for the instruction of their converts. Its contents were amplified by each of the Evangelists from sources peculiar to himself. In process of time, the more copious Gospels superseded the briefer narrative, which accordingly disappeared.

The hypothesis of such a Gospel, which was possessed of a *quasi* official recognition, hardly accords with the probable circumstances under which the first evangelical writing occurred. But if a book of this kind existed, the fact that no mention is made of it by any of the ancient ecclesiastical writers constitutes a difficulty. Luke (i. 1 seq.) apparently knew of no such authoritative document.[2] Moreover, no document having the character ascribed to the Primitive Gospel, can be framed out of the common matter in the three Gospels of the Canon. When we come to the history of the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, the variations of the canonical Gospels from one another are most marked—are so marked that the hypothetical primitive document must have been, as regards this part of the biography of Jesus, of the most meagre character. Besides, it is impossible to explain the omission of much material by one Evangelist, which, as it

[1] Holtzmann, p. 263.

[2] See Reuss, *Heilig. Schrift. d. N. T.*, p. 79.

is found in the other two, must have entered into the original narrative.

6. Schleiermacher's theory, as applied to Luke, of a great number of detached narratives brought together, is equally unsatisfactory.

Of the 124 sections in the three Gospels—short narratives capable of being separated from the context—47 are found in all, 12 in Matthew and Mark, 2 in Matthew and Luke, 6 in Mark and Luke, 17 in Matthew alone, 2 in Mark alone, 28 in Luke alone. The text of Luke has 93 sections, of Matthew 78, of Mark 67.[1]

The idea of Schleiermacher was that these sections were the primitive memoranda of disciples, which being collected and connected together, with additions from oral sources, constitute the present synoptical Gospels. This theory was better adapted to explain the differences than the coincidences of the Evangelists. How is it that, in so many instances, sections which might stand apart, are united by two or more of the Synoptists? How shall we explain the general accordance that exists in the disposition of materials so incoherent? Had we but one Evangelist instead of three, this hypothesis would present higher claims to acceptance.

7. The theory of a primitive oral Gospel has been adopted, and is still held by many, as the true explanation of the correspondences and differences in the Synoptists. As drawn out in an early essay of Gieseler,[2] it presupposes a common stock of oral narrative, from which each of the Evangelists drew. This body of narrative, it is supposed, formed itself by the necessity under which the Apostles were placed of instructing their converts, and the first preachers of the new faith, with respect to the life and

[1] I follow, in these calculations, Reuss, p. 175.

[2] *Historisch-kritischer Versuch*, etc. (1818).

teachings of the Lord. The union of the Apostles at Jerusalem, and the natural tendency, which is specially strong among the unlettered, to give a stereotyped form to narratives which are frequently rehearsed, caused the Gospel story to be repeated, to a great extent, in the same phraseology. In particular, the sayings of Jesus would be recited in the same words; and this would also be true of the sayings of other persons who appear in the narrative. As soon as the narrative, or portions of it, commenced to be written down, as in the first essays in the composition of Gospels to which Luke refers (i. 1), they would also aid in fixing it in one verbal form. At the same time, differences would exist according to the varying recollections of individuals who had occasion to relate the history of Jesus, and to make it known to converts in different places. In addition to a common stock of narrative, persons might become separately possessed of information peculiar to themselves. Hence, when the Gospels of the canon were composed, there was a main trunk, as it were, ramifying into distinct branches.

This hypothesis has the merit of taking into view both elements, the agreement and the diversity which co-exist in the Synoptical histories. It derives some support from the manner in which the instructions of the Rabbis, embracing such a vast amount of matter, were accurately remembered and transmitted by their pupils; and by the familiar fact that memory does its work best when it is most relied on, and when there is less dependence upon written helps. It involves, also, one assumption, of the truth of which there is no doubt, that there was an interval when the words and works of Jesus had no other record than that furnished by the memories of His followers. Moreover, the theory of an oral transmission of the primitive Gospel is, to a certain extent, corroborated by

authentic historical testimonies. Luke (i. 1, 2) refers to the contents of the evangelical history as "delivered" to him and his fellow-disciples by the original witnesses and "ministers of the word;" and the meaning of the term is that these facts were orally communicated. Papias, the earliest of the ecclesiastical writers who refer to the composition of the Gospels, states that Mark made up his narrative out of what he had heard from the lips of Peter.

Notwithstanding the truth which is included in this hypothesis, there are difficulties in it when regarded as a complete solution. It assumes a kind of concert among the Apostles in the work of framing a consecutive narrative, of which there is no explicit proof, and which, under the circumstances, strikes one as somewhat artificial. Then it appears from the Acts and the Epistles that the first preachers of Christianity dwelt chiefly upon certain parts of the Saviour's history, in particular His crucifixion and resurrection, without recounting in detail—at least on the first promulgation of the Gospel—the works and teachings of Jesus. But the main obstacle in the way of considering this hypothesis adequate of itself, is the nature and extent of that agreement, reaching as it does to minutiæ, to peculiar forms of words and turns of expression, which subsist among the Synoptical writers. Sentences of complicated structure are found in the same identical form in more than one of them.[1] This sort of agreement in narratives propagated by the living voice alone, in different places and after a considerable interval of time, is difficult to account for. This is the principal objection to the hypothesis in question, although the extent of the diversity in some cases, especially in the narratives of the last days of Jesus and of the circumstances connected with the Resurrection, is likewise a difficulty of no inconsiderable weight.

[1] For an illustration, see Holtzmann, p. 51.

8. On account of these reasons for believing the hypothesis of an oral Gospel, acquiring a certain fixedness by frequent repetition, insufficient, most scholars at the present time are inclined to blend this hypothesis with the supposition of a certain influence of one Evangelist upon another, or of an acquaintance on the part of one with the written work of another. Oral communication may have been a source, and a leading source of the materials which enter into the Gospels, at the same time that one of the Evangelists may have been affected, both in his choice of incidents to narrate, and in his selection of phraseology, by the example of another. In other words, in the case of one or more of the Synoptists, oral and written sources may have been combined to furnish the writer with the contents of his book; the written source, however, not being a primitive anonymous Gospel, but consisting, either wholly or in part, of one or another of the three.

Among those who have held to the interdependence of the Gospels, there have been all possible varieties of opinion on the question of priority. The hypothesis of Griesbach, which placed Matthew first and Mark latest, with Luke between them, had for a long time a wide acceptance. Mark was regarded as the product of an abridgment of the older narratives. More thorough investigation has reversed this verdict. What is the true position of Mark in relation to the other Synoptists?

(1.) An examination of the contents of the first three gospels show that the resemblances between Matthew and Mark, and between Luke and Mark, are greater than between Matthew and Luke, with regard to the materials common to the three. There are certain parallel passages where one descriptive phrase is found in Matthew, and another in Luke, while both are connected in Mark. Thus in the account of the Healing of the Leper, Mat-

thew says (viii. 3): "And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." Luke (v. 13) says: "And immediately his leprosy departed from him;" but Mark connects the two expressions (i. 42): "Immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed." [1] The following is another instance:

Matt. viii. 16.	Mark i. 32.	Luke iv. 40.
—"When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils."	—"And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils."	—"Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases, brought them unto Him."

The first impression undoubtedly is that Mark has combined the statements of the other two Evangelists. But this impression is removed when it is observed that a coupling of phrases is a peculiarity of Mark's style, that in Mark there are none of the linguistic peculiarities of either of the other two Gospels, as would have been the case had he thus borrowed from them, and that in the most striking instance of a seeming combination, which is quoted above, another solution lies at hand. Mark says (i. 32): "And at even, when the sun did set." This last phrase is added, because, according to Mark (verses 21, 29), it was the Sabbath: the sick were not brought to Jesus until the Sabbath was over. Matthew, however, does not refer to a Sabbath in connection with these miracles, and had no occasion to point out that the sun had gone down. Luke, who like Mark, speaks of the Sabbath as the date of the occurrences, naturally makes express reference to the setting of the sun. Nothing can be inferred, therefore, unfavorable to the independence of Mark from this comparison.

[1] For still other examples, see De Wette, § 80; Bleek (Ed. Mangold), p. 290.

(2.) Other evidences of Mark's independence are of great weight. He begins with the public ministry of Jesus, the subject, according to Peter, of the Apostles' testimony.[1] Why, if he had the other Gospels before him, should he omit the preliminary history, and why should he omit so much—the Lord's discourses, for example—which they contain? Why should he write a Gospel which contains so little not already on record in the other two? The character of the matter in Mark's Gospel speaks for its early date and independence.

That Mark did not copy from Matthew is shown by certain divergences which would be unaccountable on the opposite supposition. Matthew (viii. 28-34) narrates the healing of two demoniacs together at Gadara; Mark (and Luke also) speaks of but one (Mark v. 1-21, Luke viii. 26-40). Matthew (xx. 29-34) likewise has two blind men who were healed together at Jericho; Mark (and, with him, Luke) speaks of but one (Mark x. 46-52, Luke xviii. 35-43, xix. 1). If Mark had been the copyist of Matthew, we could not easily account for this needless and unexpected deviation from his authority.

(3.) The narratives in Mark do not exhibit him as an abbreviator: he is often more full than Matthew or Luke; and this, not as if he were merely expanding matter furnished from them, but as one independent in the sources of his information. The healing of the Paralytic is thus described by Matthew and Mark:—

Matt. ix. 2–8.	Mark ii. 3–12.
2 And, behold, they brought unto him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed;	3 And they came unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. 4 And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was:

[1] Acts ii. 21, 22.

and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy: Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.

3 And, behold, certain of the scribes said within themselves, This *man* blasphemeth.

4 And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?

5 For whether is easier, to say, *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk?

6 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then saith he to the sick of the palsy), Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.

7 And he arose, and departed to his house.

8 But when the multitudes saw *it*, they marvelled, and glorified God, which had given such power unto men.

and when they had broken *it* up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay.

5 When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.

6 But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts,

7 Why doth this *man* thus speak blasphemy? who can forgive sins but God only?

8 And immediately, when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts?

9 Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk?

10 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy),

11 I say unto thee Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house.

12 And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.

The healing of the Demoniac is thus related by the three Evangelists:—

MATT. xvii. 14–21.

14 And when they were come to the multitude,

MARK ix. 14–29.

14 And when he came to his disciples, he saw a great multitude about them, and

LUKE ix. 37–43.

37 And it came to pass, that on the next day, when they were come down from the

There came to him a *certain* man, kneeling down to him, and saying,

15 Lord, have mercy on my son; for he is lunatic, and sore vexed: for oft-times he falleth into the fire, and oft into the water.

16 And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him.

17 Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him hither to me.

the scribes questioning with them.

15 And straightway all the people when they beheld him, were greatly amazed, and running to *him* saluted him.

16 And he asked the scribes, What question ye with them?

17 And one of the multitude answered, and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit:

18 And wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him; and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not.

19 He answereth him and saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto me.

20 And they brought him unto him: and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming.

21 And he asked his father, How long is it

hill, much people met him.

38 And, behold a man of the company cried out, saying, Master I beseech thee, look upon my son; for he is my only child.

39 ¶ And, lo, a spirit taketh him, and he suddenly crieth out; and it teareth him that he foameth again, and bruising him, hardly departeth from him.

40 And I besought thy disciples to cast him out; and they could not.

41 And Jesus answering said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, and suffer you? Bring thy son hither.

42 And as he was yet a coming, the devil threw him down and tare *him*.

ago since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child.

22 And oft-times it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him: but if thou canst do anything have compassion on us, and help us.

23 Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things *are* possible to him that believeth.

24 And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief.

25 When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, *Thou* dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him.

26 And *the spirit* cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him; and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead.

27 But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose.

28 And when he was come into the house,

18 And Jesus rebuked the devil; and he departed out of him: and the child was cured from that very hour.

19 Then came the disciples to Jesus apart, and said, Why could not we cast him out?

20 And Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief: For verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove:

And Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, and healed the child, and delivered him again to his father.

and nothing shall be impossible unto you.

21 Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting.

his disciples asked him privately, Why could not we cast him out?

29 And he said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting.

The three Evangelists write thus of Herod and John the Baptist:—

MATT. xiv. 1–2, 6–12.

1 AT that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus,

2 And said unto his servants, This is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him.

6 But when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod.

7 Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask.

MARK vi. 14-16, 21-29.

14 And king Herod heard *of him;* (for his name was spread abroad;) and he said, That John the Baptist was risen from the dead, and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him.

15 Others said, That it is Elias. And others said, That it is a prophet, or as one of the prophets.

16 But when Herod heard *thereof*, he said, It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead.

21 And when a convenient day was come, that Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and chief *estates* of Galilee:

22 And when the daughter of the said

LUKE ix. 7–9.

7 Now Herod the tetrarch heard of all that was done by him: and he was perplexed, because that it was said of some, that John was risen from the dead;

8 And of some, that Elias had appeared; and of others, that one of the old prophets was risen again.

9 And Herod said, John have I beheaded; but who is this, of whom I hear such things? And he desired to see him.

8. And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Baptist's head in a charger.

9 And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded *it* to be given *her*.

10 And he sent and beheaded John in the prison.

11 And his head was brought in a charger, and given to the damsel: and she brought *it* to her mother.

12 And his disciples came, and took up the body, and buried it, and went and told Jesus.

Herodias came in, and danced, and pleased Herod and them that sat with him, the king said unto the damsel, Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt, and I will give *it* thee.

23 And he sware unto her, Whatsoever thou shalt ask of me, I will give *it* thee, unto the half of my kingdom.

24 And she went forth, and said unto her mother, What shall I ask? And she said, The head of John the Baptist.

25 And she came in straightway with haste unto the king, and asked, saying, I will that thou give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptist.

26 And the king was exceeding sorry; *yet* for his oath's sake, and for their sakes which sat with him, he would not reject her.

27 And immediately the king sent an executioner, and commanded his head to be brought: and he went and beheaded him in the prison,

28 And brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel;

and the damsel gave it to her mother.
29 And when his disciples heard *of it*, they came and took up his corpse, and laid it in a tomb.

(4) The lively style of Mark, with the graphic touches which are mingled in his narrative, are as far as possible from being characteristic of a copyist.

They are best explained by supposing an access to original sources on the part of the writer. So fresh a conception of the facts narrated belongs not to one who is transcribing what has been recorded by other authors. Especially is it important to remark that many of the circumstances which are peculiar to his narrative, bear on them the plain stamp of historical verity.

The independence of Mark as related to the other Gospels, is one of the most assured and most valuable results of recent criticism. The question arises now whether the second Gospel had a direct influence upon the composition of the first and third?

This question is answered affirmatively by many scholars. It is supposed to have been in the hands of the other Synoptists, and in this way, partly, their mutual agreement is accounted for.

But certain able critics who do not hold to an actual use of Mark by the other two Evangelists, and who make oral tradition the one prime source of all three works, nevertheless hold that Mark represents this tradition in its first form. Thus Professor Westcott holds that the "many" earlier attempts at recording the evangelical history, to which Luke (i. 1) adverts, aided in giving fixedness to the form of the oral tradition; and that the

Gospel of Mark contributed to the same result, helping, also, to establish that general outline of the Saviour's ministry, or distribution of the matter, which we find preserved in all three. But he does not, it would seem, deem it necessary to suppose that the second Gospel was actually used by the other Synoptists in composing their books,[1] or even that it was necessarily first written.

Of the origin of the Second Gospel the ancient ecclesiastical writers give an account which there is no good reason to distrust. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, is called by Eusebius "a companion" of Polycarp, a pupil of the Apostle John. Polycarp was born A. D. 69, and died, as it is now ascertained, A. D. 155. Papias had himself known some of the immediate disciples of Jesus. In a fragment quoted by Eusebius from his "Exposition of the Oracles of the Lord," he says of one of the disciples, the Presbyter, or Elder, John:—

"And the Elder said this: 'Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately whatever he remembered, not, however, recording in order (ἐν τάξει) what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him; but afterwards, as I said, he [attended] Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs [of his hearers], but not as designing to furnish a connected account (σύνταξιν) of the Lord's oracles (κυριακῶν λογίων or λόγων); so that Mark made no mistake while thus writing down some things as he remembered them. For of one thing he took care—to omit nothing which he heard, and not to set down any false statement therein.'" "Such," adds Eusebius, "is the relation in Papias concerning Mark. But concerning Matthew, this is said: 'So then Matthew wrote the oracles (τὰ λόγια) in the Hebrew language, and every one interpreted them as he was able.'"[2]

Irenæus tells us that after the death of Peter and Paul at Rome, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, "gave to us in writing what had been uttered by Peter in his preaching."[3] The Gospel is ascribed to Mark by Clement

[1] Introd. to the Gospels, pp. 213, 214.
[2] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39.
[3] *Adv. Hær.*, III. i. 1.

of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and others. The statement of Papias, the earliest testimony on the subject, has been a fruitful subject of scrutiny and debate. The important question is whether he refers to the canonical Gospel in its existing form, or to a primitive Mark, of which our Gospel is a later recension. No mention of such a primitive Mark is made by any ancient writer; if such a work existed, it perished without making a sign. Considering the time when Papias wrote, it seems quite improbable that a Gospel of Mark could have been in the hands of Papias, and, as we must infer, in general circulation at that time, of which these writers had never heard. Papias implies that the Gospel written by Mark was incomplete. The comparative brevity of the second Gospel, and its omission of so much matter which the other Gospels contain, justifies this comment. That the Gospel should be said to want orderly or chronological arrangement is not, to be sure, so easy of explanation. It is possible, however, that Papias had in mind the orderly arrangement of John's Gospel. Another writer, the author of the Muratorian fragment, speaks of Mark's relation to Peter in terms similar to those used by Papias, and proceeds to characterize John's Gospel as an orderly record. Dr. Lightfoot considers it probable that this author was acquainted with the corresponding statements of Papias, and affords a clue to their meaning.[1]

But whatever may have moved Papias to this comment upon Mark, to postulate, on account of it, the existence of a work otherwise unknown is too heavy a load for such a

[1] Contemporary Review, Oct. 1875. May not Papias have had in mind the prologue of Luke, where the orderly arrangement—*ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν*—is set down as a leading object in composing the Gospels? That Luke was known to Papias, it is safe to affirm. The silence of Eusebius (in his quotations from Papias), as will be seen hereafter, is not of the slightest weight against this proposition.

remark to bear, which may be in fact only the impression of an individual. When we turn to the internal grounds which Professor Holtzmann and other advocates of the "Ur-Marcus" hypothesis bring forward in behalf of their own opinion, we find them, to be sure, not destitute of plausibility; but they savor too much of conjecture to produce conviction. The critics, however, who assume a primitive Mark, the predecessor of the canonical Gospel, hold that the earlier work comprised nearly all the matter which our Gospel contains. It is a fair and unavoidable conclusion of the most searching criticism that in the second Gospel is presented substantially the testimony which was given by the immediate disciples of Christ, although it includes of course but a fraction of the works which He performed, and a smaller portion of His words.

"But concerning Matthew, this is said: 'So then Matthew wrote the oracles (*τὰ λόγια*) in the Hebrew language and every one interpreted them as he was able.'"[1] Irenæus says: "So Matthew put forth a Gospel among the Hebrews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul at Rome were preaching the Gospel and founding the Church."[2] The Hebrew original of the Gospel is also asserted by Jerome and by other Fathers. Of these patristic testimonies, that of Papias is the earliest and most important.

1. The first question to be determined with regard to the statement of Papias is the sense of the term "Oracles" (*λόγια*). Schleiermacher introduced the interpretation, in which he has been followed by a large number of critics, which makes Papias refer, under this term, exclusively to "discourses" of Christ, and which holds that the Aramaic Gospel which he describes consisted solely of these.

To this interpretation we are not at all compelled by philology. The term *Logia*—Oracles—is used by early

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 39. [2] Adv. Hær. iii. 1 (Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8).

ecclesiastical writers for the Scriptures, as including both narrative matter and discourses.[1] That Gospels might be designated as Scriptures, and referred to as it was customary to refer to the Old Testament, is proved by a passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, which was written very early in the second century—a generation earlier than the work of Papias; for that Epistle introduces a quotation from Matthew with the words: "It is written."[2] There is nothing in the fragment of Papias to make it certain that the statement respecting Matthew, like that respecting Mark, was from John the Presbyter: it may have been from some other authority. If it was from John the Presbyter, it is probable that it did not stand in connection with the passage relative to Mark. Hence, no contrast between the contents of Mark, as embracing both deeds and words, and Matthew as including only one element, can be intended. But in the passage about Mark, there is no reason for restricting the sense of *Logia*, and for holding that Papias attributes a want of arrangement to the *discourses* in this Evangelist, which he does not attribute to his narrative of the acts of Christ. Papias speaks of a want of orderly arrangement in what Mark wrote down, specifying both the deeds and words of Jesus. Then, explaining that Mark had not himself heard the Lord, he reiterates the remark that he did not make an orderly arrangement (σύνταξιν) of the *Logia*. From the collocation of words in this last remark, it is evident that no stress is laid upon *Logia*, as if the discourses in their lack of arrangement were distinguished from another portion of the Gospel, which would be contrary to what Papias had just said. Hence it is altogether more natural to take this term as a synonym of

[1] See Dr. Lightfoot's remarks, *Cont. Review*, 1875, p. 399 seq.; Bleek, *Einl. in d. N. T.*, p. 115 seq.

[2] Barnab. Epist. iv.

"what was either said or done" (ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα). In short, there is nothing in either passage separately taken, nor in the conjunction of the two, to support the theory of Schleiermacher concerning the meaning of Papias.[1]

It is very improbable that Papias had in mind any other Aramaic Gospel than the work which Irenæus and his contemporaries referred to as having been composed by the Evangelist in that language. It is not to be assumed that these writers all derived their information on this point from Papias. If they did, they all understood him as speaking of the entire Gospel, and not of the discourses alone. If they did not derive their information from him, then the fact involved in the old interpretation given to Papias is confirmed by independent authorities.[2]

The theory that Matthew's authorship was confined to a book of the Lord's discourses must depend for its support, not upon the language of Papias, but upon internal peculiarities of the Gospel itself. The manner in which discourses are grouped together in the First Gospel, the mode in which Matthew himself is referred to, it being supposed that Matthew would not speak of himself in this way; the omission of events which an Apostle might be expected to record, such as the interviews of Jesus with the Disciples after the Resurrection, of which we have accounts from Paul (1 Cor. xv. 3–9), and from the other Evangelists,—these and other characteristics of the First Gospel are urged as reasons for disconnecting the narrative portion of the book from Matthew. This work, it is claimed, was a collection of the Lord's discourses, which received afterwards the supplement of narrative by which they are broken up into large fragments.

[1] Renan holds that our Mark answers to the description of Papias. *Les Évangiles*, pp. 126, 120.

[2] See Lightfoot, *Ibid.*, p. 399.

But admitting the phenomena which are here pointed out, and the difficulties which they suggest, it is doubtful whether a division of the Gospel in the way proposed is the right solution of the problems thus presented.

2. On the question whether the first Gospel was written in Aramaic, there is not less difference of opinion than on the question of unity of authorship. The "Gospel of the Hebrews," a gospel resembling our Matthew, was in use among the Judaizing Christians, and it is held by some that this circumstance early gave rise to the erroneous supposition that the Greek Gospel is a translation from the Hebrew.[1] The verbal coincidences between our Matthew

[1] A few words may be said here upon the relation of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* to our Matthew. There are traces of the use of that Gospel, in somewhat varying forms, among the Judaic or Ebionite Christians of Palestine, from the end of the second century to the beginning of the fifth. It was ascribed by them to Matthew. It was known to Jerome, and was translated by him into Greek and Latin (*de vir. illustr.* c. 2). This fact of itself proves that there must have been differences between that Gospel and the canonical Matthew. Of the character of these differences (which co-existed with a general similarity), we are enabled to judge by the citations from it in the Fathers. For these, see Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canonem receptum*, Fasc. iv., pp. 5–38. The later and apocryphal origin of these passages in which the *Gospel of the Hebrews* deviates from our Matthew, is obvious. Cf. Mangold, in Bleek's *Einl. in d. N. T.*, p. 132 n., and *Essays on the Sup. Origin of Christ.*, pp. 167, 168, 195. Jerome appears at first to have shared in what he states to have been the common opinion that the Gospel of the Hebrews was the Hebrew original of our Matthew. This is the most probable interpretation of Jerome, although Meyer (*Ev. Matt.*, *Einl.*, p. 18) seeks to prove that he refers to two separate books, one of which he transcribed, and the other he translated. The *Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles*, not improbably the *Gospel of the Egyptians*, and possibly *the Gospel of Peter*, were the same Gospel of the Hebrews with variations of content. For the facts and references on the subject of this note, see Mangold's ed. of Bleek, pp. 127 seq., 372 seq., Reuss, *Gesch. d. heilig. Schrift. d. N. T.*, 198 seq., Hilgenfeld, *Einl. in d. N. T.*, p. 40 seq. But the hypothesis that the uncanonical passages in Justin are from the Gospel to the Hebrews is quite precarious; and the theory that both Justin and the

and the other Synoptists require us to assume, either that the first Gospel was written at the outset in the language in which we have it, or that, in the process of rendering it into the Greek, it was accommodated verbally, to the extent to which verbal correspondences exist, to the Greek tradition already established. "The parts of the Aramaic oral Gospel," says Professor Westcott, "which were adopted by St. Matthew, already existed in the Greek counterpart. The change was not so much a revision as a substitution." Yet such a revision of the Greek oral Gospel as would exactly answer to Matthew's revision of the Aramaic, may, perhaps, not have been committed to writing till the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Hebrew and Greek Christians ceased to be in close connection. Then, Professor Westcott holds, the Greek Gospel was written, "not indeed as a translation, but as a representation of the original, as a Greek oral counterpart was already current."[1]

author of the Clementine Homilies drew from the Gospel of Peter will not bear examination. It is not sustained by a fair comparison of the citations in the two books. The instances of verbal coincidence—so far as such exist between Justin's references and those of the Clementines—are quite inadequate to prove a common source distinct from the canonical Gospels. Justin refers to the homiletic use of the Gospel Memoirs: they were read in the churches, in city and country. But this was true, as far as can be ascertained, only of the Four Gospels of the Canon; except that the Gospel of the Hebrews was read in the Ebionitic communities. Justin's variations from the text in his quotations are not peculiar to him; other and later Fathers exhibit the same sort of inaccuracy. Justin quotes other writers with quite as much freedom as to the verbal form: see, e. g., Apol., i. 10. He quotes the same passages in different forms himself. The Author of "Supernatural Religion" refers to Justin's citation of Matt. xi. 27, and to his use of the aorist for the present ("knew" for "knoweth"). The inference is that the passage was drawn from an heretical Gospel. But Justin (Dial., 100) again cites the passage, giving the verb in the present, showing that he was in the habit of quoting from memory, and frequently without any apparent attempt to cite the text *verbatim*.

[1] Introduction to the Gospels, p. 231, n.

Such additional notes as Matt. xxviii. 15, may have been added at this time.

3. The uncertainty as to the language in which the First Gospel was originally written, and difficulties attending the supposition that Matthew wrote it in its present form, do not preclude a safe judgment respecting the antiquity and credibility of the Gospel as it stands. The Greek Matthew of the canon has pervading characteristics of style. To mention one peculiarity,—the "kingdom of heaven" is a phrase which occurs thirty-two times in this Gospel, and occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. There is a long list of words which either occur in Matthew alone among the Synoptists, or occur so frequently in Matthew, as to form a distinctive peculiarity of this Gospel.[1]

Now the Greek Matthew of our Bibles was in the hands of Papias and his contemporaries. He does not say that every one *interprets* the Hebrew *Logia* as he can, but, "every one *interpreted* (ἡρμήνευσε) it as he could." The aorist shows incontestably that he speaks of a necessity that had once existed, but existed no longer. There is internal evidence, to which we shall advert on a subsequent page, which proves that the First Gospel, as we have it, existed as early as the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. There is nothing to militate against this conclusion, in the testimony of Papias, nor in anything to be found in the early Fathers. It is quoted as a sacred Scripture by the author of the Epistle of Barnabas.[2] It is a safe conclusion that the Apostle Matthew had such a relation to this Gospel as naturally caused his name to be uniformly connected with it in the ecclesiastical tradition as its author.[3]

[1] See Holtzmann, p. 292 seq., for other characteristics of the style of the First Gospel; and Westcott, p. 360 n.

[2] Hilgenfeld places the date of this Epistle as early as A. D. 97. *Einl. in d. N. T.*, p. 38.

[3] The relative place of the First Gospel, as an authority for the Life

On a review of the whole subject, we cannot doubt that the first Three Gospels sprang both from oral and written sources. It is altogether probable that memoranda would be very early made of particular events, or groups of events, in the life of Jesus. They would not only be related orally, but would also be put in writing. The same is true of the discourses of Christ. It seems probable that these earliest records were of Galilean origin. The next step would be the combination of such distinct memoranda, together with additional matter derived orally, in connected narratives. In this process the matter was massed, so to speak, under the three heads, the Saviour's Baptism and Temptation, His labors in Galilee, and His experiences at Jerusalem. To these essays in the composition of gospels, Luke refers (Luke i. 1, 2). Before he wrote, many had undertaken the same task. Their materials were the oral and written testimony of the immediate witnesses of the ministry of Jesus. The efforts of those previous authors had been to bring these materials into orderly arrangement. He sets about the same work, and adverts to the advantages which he had for successfully accomplishing it. There is reason to believe that Mark's gospel, being of earlier date, was one of the prior gospels which Luke speaks of; and, since the testimony of Papias acquaints us with the fact that Mark was a hearer

of Jesus, depends upon the view taken as to the agency of Matthew in its composition. Those who, with Ellicott (*Life of Christ*, p. 150 n. 2), ascribe the Gospel in its present amplified Greek form to the Evangelist, would naturally place it in the same category with the Fourth Gospel. A somewhat different estimate would result from Prof. Westcott's opinion (*Intr. to the Gospels*, p. 231 n.) that "by whose hand the Greek Gospel was drawn up is wholly unknown." By writers like Neander (*Leben Jesu*, pp. 10, 178, 179), and Pressensé (*Jésus-Christ, sa Vie, son Temps*, etc., p. 197 seq.), who hold that the original work of Matthew was of a more limited compass, our First Gospel is placed on a level with the Gospels of Mark and Luke.

of Peter, a Gospel composed under such advantages would naturally be used by Luke much more than other documents not possessed of an equal claim to attention. It is certainly not improbable that a collection of discourses of Jesus, accompanied by brief explanatory matter of a narrative cast, was early composed; and it may be that the Gospel of Matthew in its present form is the result of an amplification of this original document. In this case, it is a question not easy to be determined, whether the primitive Matthew, or the First Gospel in its existing form, was used by Luke, in addition to the other sources of information as to the discourses of Christ, which were at his command.

That we have in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark—we shall speak more in particular of the other Gospels hereafter—a picture of the life, teachings, and miracles of Jesus, such as the immediate disciples of the Master were in the habit of presenting to their converts, is the fair deduction of a sound and searching historical criticism.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WRITINGS OF LUKE.

Our New Testament canon contains two books, the Third Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles, which are attributed by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and other writers in the latter part of the second century, and by Origen, Tertullian, and their contemporaries, to Luke, a companion of Paul. None of the Fathers imply that any doubt or dispute respecting the authorship of these writings had ever existed, from the day of their first appearance. Their testimony is a witness to the tradition received by the universal church in the closing part of the second century.

The Apostle Paul makes mention of an associate bearing the name of Luke. In the Epistle to Philemon, he sends a greeting from him, and styles him one of his fellow-laborers (vs. 24). Luke is referred to again in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 14), as "the beloved physician;" and the context indicates that he was of Gentile birth. Once more, in the Second Epistle to Timothy, he is spoken of as the only companion of Paul at that time (iv. 11). Justin Martyr does not mention the Evangelists by name in his extant writings; nor from the drift and design of these writings would he naturally be led to do so. It is manifest, however, from his quotations,[1] that the

[1] See e. g. Apol. i. 33; Dial c. Tryph., 105, cf. Luke xxiii. 46; Ibid. c. 103, cf. Luke xxii. 44.

Third Gospel was among the "Memoirs," written by the "Apostles and their Followers," from which he drew his knowledge of the evangelical history. But we are provided with an indirect testimony, in the first half of the second century, of a conclusive character. Marcion was the leader of a Gnostic party, which, in its one-sided zeal for Paul and his doctrine, and in its earnest, but incomplete, view of the divine compassion revealed in the Gospel, discarded the Old Testament, and rejected the other Apostles, He came from Pontus, in Asia Minor, to Rome about A. D. 140. He made use of a Gospel which the Fathers with one voice declare to have been a mutilated Luke,—his design having been to expunge in the Third Gospel, which he accepted as coming from a companion of Paul, passages which recognize the Old Testament system. Of the priority of the canonical Luke there was formerly no doubt. There are few critics even of the Rationalistic schools who differ on this point from the general opinion. The arguments on which this conviction rests are irrefutable. Through the quotations of Tertullian and Epiphanius, we are enabled to compare Marcion's Luke with the Luke of the canon. Marcion's Gospel is found to include nothing in the way of discourse or narrative which is not contained in the Gospel of the canon. The deviations of Marcion are just of the nature which we should expect from the motive ascribed to him. If he does not carry out his expurgations with perfect consistency and success, this fact affords no room for surprise, and no good occasion for doubt as to his purpose. Moreover, the Third Gospel is marked by certain definite peculiarities of style. The writer has a vocabulary of his own —favorite words, and collocations of words. These characteristics are found to the full extent in the parts of the canonical Gospel not contained in Marcion. These are

plainly of a piece with the other portions of the canonical Luke. It is impossible that these peculiarities of style, which are detected only by close observation, could have been imitated. We are justified, therefore, in concluding with all confidence that the Gospel of the canon was not the result of an amplification of Marcion's document, but that Marcion's document sprang, as the Fathers assert, from a curtailment of the Gospel.[1] This inference is not without the strongest corroboration in the probabilities of the case. Who will believe that the Church in the second century took up the Gospel of an heretical sect, and made it the basis of one of its own authoritative Scriptures? The only reasonable hypothesis is that the canonical Luke was already an acknowledged authority in the Church, when Marcion constructed his system. He took a known and recognized Gospel, received by the Church as the work of Luke, a companion of Paul, and endeavored to shape it to suit his own ideas of the Pauline system. But there is another point still in the argument. Marcion's Gospel, beside the arbitrary alterations which make up, for the most part, his divergences from corresponding passages in Luke, shows that he occasionally followed another text. The manuscript on which he performed his work had readings peculiar to itself, as distinguished from existing codices. The evidence is such as to make it clear that manuscripts of the Third Gospel had so far multiplied that different readings, and readings of a peculiar type, had come to exist.[2] We do not know how old Marcion was when he came to Rome, and made himself conspicuous there. But he must have been born near the beginning of the second century. We cannot account for the phenomena connected with Marcion's Gospel, without supposing the canonical

[1] See Mr. Sanday's *Gospels in the Second Century*, ch. viii.

[2] See Mr. Sanday, *Ibid.*

Gospel, on which it was based, to have been in general circulation in the first quarter of the second century, and received by the churches as the production of the "fellow-laborer" of Paul. This carries us back within the life-time of many of the contemporaries of Luke, and satisfies every reasonable requirement as regards external evidence.

We turn now to the contents of the two works which the ancient Church, without contradiction, attributed to this writer.

First, they were written, both of them, by the same author. The book of Acts opens with a reference to the Gospel, and is addressed to the same Theophilus for whom the Gospel was primarily written. But our proposition does not rest upon the unsupported assertion of the writer. That both books emanated from the same hand is now a universally, or almost universally, admitted inference from the peculiarities of style to which we have already adverted. They extend so far, that—since it is impossible otherwise to account for them, by supposing, for example, that they were artificially introduced into either of the two books—their common origin is a necessary deduction.

Secondly, the author of the Gospel professes to have derived his information at first hand from those who witnessed and participated in the events to be described. Many "had taken in hand"—the term denotes the writer's sense of the seriousness and difficulty of the task—to write the evangelical history. The facts, in the belief of which he and his fellow-Christians were established, had been delivered to him and them by the Apostles and other immediate disciples of the Lord,—for this is the meaning of his language. He had learned these facts orally, or, it might be, in part, from writings; but he distinguishes his sources of knowledge from the class of works which many, situated like himself as not being immediate witnesses, had

composed. He had taken pains to trace back the history to the very first—that is to the birth of Christ, and of John the Baptist, instead of going only to "the beginning," the commencement of the public ministry of Jesus. He proposed to make a consecutive narrative in order that Theophilus might know the unassailable certainty, or reality, of the faith in which he had been instructed. So far, then, as a plain, deliberate, simple asseveration goes, we have proof that the Third Gospel proceeds from the pen of a contemporary of the first disciples, and that he derived its contents from them.[1]

Thirdly, the author of these books was imbued with the characteristic principles of Paul. That type of theology, that mode of regarding Christ and His salvation, belongs to the writer of the Third Gospel, and of the Acts. His tone and spirit are what we should expect in one who had listened with sympathy to the teaching of the Apostle to the Gentiles. This position is universally allowed; hence there is no need of argument in support of it.

Fourthly, the author discovers himself to have been a companion of Paul; and he does this in a way to remove all

[1] Professor Holtzmann (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.*, xxi. i. p. 85 seq.), has endeavored to show that Luke made use of the writings of Josephus. But his arguments, founded largely on certain verbal resemblances, lack force. Because Luke says—*κράτιστε Θεόφιλε*, and Josephus—*κράτιστε Ἐπαφρόδιτε*, the inference that the one writer was acquainted with the other is about as well founded as the conclusion would be that one author copied from another, because both begin with "Dear Sir." That Luke did not use Josephus is satisfactorily proved by Professor Schürer (*Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 1876, pp. 574-582). Dr. Schürer says: "Entweder hat Lucas von Josephus keine Notiz genommen, oder er hat nachträglich von seiner Lectüre wiederum Alles vergessen. Die erstere Annahme als die einfachere scheint mir den Vorzug zu verdienen" (p. 582). Critics who would convict Luke of inaccuracies by appealing to Josephus should not make Josephus the source of his materials.

reasonable doubt of the fact. The narrative in the Acts moves on as we should expect of a historian who has derived his information from oral and written sources, until the Apostle Paul arrives at Troas (xvi. 10), when there is a sudden transition to the first person plural—"immediately we endeavored to go into Macedonia." The narrator, if we follow this pronominal clue, was in the company of Paul as far as Philippi. Here he was left behind, during the rest of the Apostle's second missionary journey. But he joins Paul again, apparently at Philippi (Acts xx. 5), and continues with him to the end of the history, when Paul has reached Rome. These passages of the Acts are stamped with the minute and graphic touches that show the narrator to have been an eye-witness. The account of Paul's voyage and shipwreck, for example, is so full and so exact in its details, that it must have come from one who was with him. If this companion was not the author of the book, then its author took up, without advertising his readers of the fact, a document emanating from some other person who was with Paul, and who made a record of what occurred. But these passages are homogeneous in style with the rest of the book; they exhibit the literary characteristics which are found elsewhere in the Third Gospel and in the Acts. The hypothesis that a document is incorporated which was composed by another, is precluded, unless it is held that the pronoun "we" was retained on purpose to deceive the reader into the persuasion that it was the author of the book who attended Paul, and that he is relating what he saw himself. This theory is actually adopted by certain critics, of whom Zeller is one. They are driven to the alternative of admitting that the author of the book was with Paul, or is guilty of a trick of the sort described. But what a character does their notion attribute to the writer of Acts! How expert in knavery he must have been, to

re-write a document of this nature, in order to assimilate it to his own style, while taking care to leave this pronominal feature, to stand as an artless indication of personal presence! Would not a man of this character have made his pretended association with Paul more conspicuous? Would he have left it merely to be inferred by the observant reader? The hypothesis of Zeller is repugnant to a sound critical, as well as a healthy moral, feeling. The circumstance that Luke does not expressly mention the fact of his joining Paul at Troas, unexpected, at first sight, as that circumstance is, is much more easily explained than would be the silent introduction of a fragment from another hand, re-composed, as it must have been, if this hypothesis is admitted.[1] The book of Acts was written for an acquaintance, or friend, Theophilus, to whom Luke's relations to Paul were known, and who was quite probably acquainted with the fact that Luke joined the Apostle on the occasion of his passing into Europe.[2] There was no occasion, or certainly much less occasion, for an explicit declaration to this effect, than if the narrative had been primarily drawn up for strangers, for the public generally. Whatever may be thought as to the sufficiency of this explanation of Luke's omission to state definitely that here at Troas he joined Paul, it is a thousand times more natural and rational to regard his silence as the result of an artless neglect, than to impute it to the profound calculation of a mendacious writer, intent upon a pious fraud.

There is no work of classical antiquity whose genuineness would be doubted for a moment, if it were sustained by evidence equal in amount to that which we have pre-

[1] "Car admettre que cet ἡμεῖς vienne d'un document inséré par l'auteur dans sa narration est souverainement invraisemblable." Renan, *Les Évangiles*, p. 436, n. 2.

[2] See Meyer, *Apostelgesch.*, Einl. p. 5.

sented in behalf of Luke. That Eusebius quotes from Papias anecdotes pertaining to the composition of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, affords not a shadow of proof that this Father was not acquainted with Luke. The motive that guided Eusebius in these references and citations is declared by himself; and both from his own professions, and from his practice in regard to authors who are extant, it is certain that it was no part of his intention to mention all of the canonical books that Papias and the other fathers, to whom he alludes under this head, used.[1] The testimony of the ecclesiastical writers of the second century, so far as they have any occasion to refer to the subject, is unanimous. We have the great fact of the adoption of these two books by the Church, although they sprang from a non-apostolic writer. And the internal evidence of authorship is of the most conclusive character.

There is no writer of the New Testament who affords so abundant means of testing his knowledge and accuracy as Luke. An author not well informed, writing long after the events, would not be able to save himself from numberless anachronisms in the composition of a book like the Acts. The effect of investigation has been to vindicate the accuracy of Luke in a multitude of particulars; and if in a few points there are difficulties of chronology which have not been solved, it is a case where the exception proves the rule.

In recent times, Baur, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, and the other members of the so-called Tübingen school, have impeached the truthfulness of the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts, on the ground of alleged perversions of history on his part. Sometimes it is held that earlier works were recast, and amplified, by a later writer from whom the books in their existing form emanate. It is not requisite

[1] See Prof. Lightfoot's Art., *Cont. Review*, Jan., 1875.

to enumerate here the various hypotheses, or guesses, which have been propounded on this branch of the subject. The points on which these critics agree are that the author of the Third Gospel and of the Acts took unwarranted liberties with historical facts in order to give a strong Pauline coloring to the life and teachings of Jesus, and in order to make it appear that the Apostle to the Gentiles was not at variance with the other Apostles and with the body of Jewish Christians. The assumption at the basis of this criticism, and of this attack upon Luke, is that Peter and Paul, with their respective followers, were in direct antagonism as to the obligations of the Gentile believers to submit to circumcision and to the Mosaic ritual generally; an assumption which is shown to be false by the explicit testimony of Paul himself.[1] That Luke was a disciple of Paul, and that as such, and as being himself of Gentile birth, he was interested in what may be termed the universal features of the Gospel, as it was taught by Jesus; and that this circumstance affected his selection of matter, and to some extent, the tone of his narrative, is conceded. The question is whether his position and feeling led him to suppress, distort, and invent facts, in order to make a false impression respecting the evangelical history. It is evident, also, that, in the Acts, he is interested in tracing the method by which the Gospel was opened to the Gentile world. This, in truth, is the main thread that links together his narrative; and, probably more than any other consideration, determined him in choosing what events to describe and what to omit. But the question here is whether he was a wilful falsifier, or not. He can be convicted of being this, only by the most arbitrary and inconsistent criticism. We may do full justice to the learning, industry, and acuteness of

[1] Gal. ii. 9.

Zeller and of others who have assailed the credibility of Luke, while, at the same time, we assert what we believe will be the verdict of competent and unbiased judges,—that their impeachment of Luke, and their exegesis in support of it, rest upon groundless, gratuitous suspicion, such as, in the ordinary concerns of life, is habitually repelled by a healthy moral nature. A morbid judgment discerns cunning, fraud, and far-seeing calculation, where there is nothing but simplicity and uncalculating honesty. Passages that disprove the Tübingen indictment are lightly passed over, or subjected to a forced explanation which robs them of their natural meaning.

A few illustrations of this kind of criticism in its application to the Third Gospel, must be presented. They are mostly taken from a recent publication, Hilgenfeld's "Introduction to the New Testament."[1] Matthew (viii. 5–13) gives an account of the healing of the Roman Centurion's son, and of Christ's commendation of the Centurion's faith. This passage as found in Matthew perplexes the Tübingen school of critics, who are not prepared for such a narrative in the Judæo-Christian Gospel. But Luke, in the parallel passage (vii. 1–10), who would be expected, according to the system of the critics, to make the most of the remarkable favor shown by Jesus to a Gentile, on the contrary makes the Centurion's request to have been conveyed by the elders of the Jews, who praise him as worthy; "for," they say, "he loveth our nation and hath built us a synagogue." That is, they found their request on what he had done for the Jews. Hilgenfeld is obliged to say that the Evangelist has given the narrative a Judaistic shape ("judaistischer gestaltet"), and made of the Centurion a kind of Jewish proselyte. One would think that such

[1] *Historisch-kritische Einl. in d. N. T.*, von Dr. Adolf Hilgenfeld (Leipzig, 1875).

a proceeding would tend to shake the confidence of the critic in his theory about the covert purpose of Luke to give exaggerated emphasis to everything favorable to the Gentiles, and to add to this element out of his own invention. But no; Hilgenfeld is equal to the emergency. Luke could not make use of the Centurion "as a mere heathen," "because he reserved the decided overstepping of the Jewish activity of Jesus for the mission of the seventy (x. 1 seq)."[1] There was an artistic motive; the writer must wait for what he thought a better occasion for bringing Jesus forward in this new field. Apart from the question how this trick of the Evangelist was revealed to the mind of Hilgenfeld, how strange the supposition is that Luke should have felt it necessary to throw away a fact in the life of Jesus, which must have harmonized exactly with his wishes and ideas, simply for the reason that he was intending to record another fact of the same general tenor, even if it were of more important significance. But let us look at the mission of the Seventy. This, we are assured, Luke invented, in order to introduce a ministry of Jesus, through them, outside of Jewish limits; the number seventy being pitched upon as representing the heathen nations enumerated in Genesis (c.x.).[2] But the number, in all probability, was fixed upon by Jesus, on account of the seventy elders, the assistants of Moses, and with no reference whatever to the heathen. Nor is there the least intimation by the Evangelist that the seventy went to a non-Jewish population. Thus the reason assigned for the inconvenient cast given by Luke to the incident connected with the Centurion—a very flimsy reason at best—is despoiled of its frail foundation. Luke leaves out the severe rebuke of Peter—"Get thee behind me, Satan"—recorded by Matthew and Mark. This would be most

[1] Hilgenfeld, p. 559. [2] Ibid., p. 562.

remarkable if his purpose were to exhibit the twelve in an unfavorable light, as is alleged. Hilgenfeld has no better explanation of this omission than to attribute it to Luke's wish to record "at once" the words of Jesus relative to following Him (Luke ix. 23.).[1] But why should he be in a hurry to give these words "at once?" Why a needless haste that requires him to throw away one of the choicest weapons in his armory? Luke presents in the passage from ix. 51 to xviii. 5, what the Germans call the "Great Intercalation," which contains much matter not found in the other Evangelists. Here occur the Parable of the Good Samaritan, the Parables of the Prodigal Son, the Lost Piece of Money, and the Lost Sheep, and the Story of the Pharisee and Publican. These pearls in the evangelical teaching, which are stamped with indubitable marks of genuineness, are objects of suspicion to the Tübingen critics. They are brought forward by Luke, we are told, to give support to his more catholic, or Pauline ideas, which he would carry back into the teaching of Jesus. Hilgenfeld makes the parables in the xvth of Luke refer to the heathen as contrasted with the Jews;[2] whereas it is explicitly stated that it was with reference to "publicans and sinners" that they were uttered. Their broader application is legitimate, but such is not their direct meaning and intent. The existence of this "Great Intercalation" is a proof that Luke had access to the primitive sources of information. It is a strong argument for the genuineness of the Third Gospel. Hilgenfeld would discredit the statements respecting Martha and Mary (x. 38–42).[3] He first imputes to the Evangelist the design to set the Jews, represented by Martha, in contrast with the Gentiles represented by Mary; but this allegorical intent exists only in the critic's imagination. When Hilgenfeld comes to the

[1] Ibid., p. 561. [2] Ibid., pp. 565, 572. [3] Ibid., p. 563.

promise to the twelve (Luke xxii. 30), that they shall sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, he can find no other consolation for the distinction put upon the original Disciples, so opposed to the critic's theory of the purpose of Luke, than the reflection—which is contrary to the real purport of the passage—that they have only the promise of judging the Jews.[1] The plain truth is, that the assailants of Luke can scarcely take a step without stumbling upon something which overturns their position. One of their main charges is, that he is "antinomian;" that is, averse to the Mosaic law. But they are obliged to confront such a passage as this (xvi. 17): "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than one tittle of the law to fail;" and they are driven to substitute for "law" the altered text of Marcion, which is destitute of manuscript authority, and is evidently one of his arbitrary changes. But the passage does not stand alone. As Professor Holtzmann observes: "The notion of the *νόμος* occurs even oftener in Luke than in Matthew; and the Evangelist in whom it never appears under this name is not Luke, but Mark; and so passages like Luke v. 14, x. 25-28, xvii. 14, xviii. 18-20 are no longer to be called mere exceptions."[2] The conclusion of Professor Holtzmann, whose work on the Synoptic Gospels is one of the most thorough products of German learning, and who is very far from being biased by traditional opinion, is thus expressed: "The Pauline stand-point of Luke conditions, to be sure, the selection and presentation of the matter; here and there, also, the verbal expression of the transmitted Discourses, yet not so as if a subjective 'tendency' usurped the place of an objective view of the historical truth."[3] Every historian who is a man of feeling, will have a lively interest in certain aspects of his subject, and this

[1] Ibid., p. 573. [2] Die Synopt. Evangelien, p. 398. [3] Ibid., 394.

will appear, and may properly appear in his narrative. Such a peculiarity is at a world-wide remove from falsification, whether conscious, or the effect of partisan excitement.

The main force of the critical attack upon Luke has been directed against the book of Acts. Here, if we are to believe Baur and Zeller, is a systematic perversion of the facts of the Apostolical history, and, also, the deliberate addition of narrative matter without foundation in truth. The motive ascribed to the writer, who composed this book not earlier than the beginning of the second century, is to pacify the strife between the Petrine or Jewish Christians, and the adherents of the liberal theology of Paul. To this end he makes Paul concede what this Apostle in fact steadfastly refused to allow to the Jewish side, and, in turn, attributes to Peter liberal professions and practices which are equally without warrant in the actual history. All pains are taken to represent Paul as having stood in a friendly relation to the older Apostles and to the Jewish Christians, which, we are assured, was not at all the case. The Tübingen critics start with a certain theory as to the real state of things in the Apostolic age, which they profess to extract from the Pauline Epistles, or such of them as they admit to be genuine; and by this conception as a touchstone, they test the narratives in the Acts, sifting them and recasting them as the exigencies of their theory may dictate. Upon the correctness of this preconceived idea, which is adopted as a criterion of judgment, the value of their whole procedure depends.

It is of course impossible, in this place, to follow the critics in question through the entire book of Acts, and examine every point which bears on the credibility of the author. It is practicable, however, to test the correctness of their premises, and to look at their treatment of certain

passages of prime importance, by which the tenableness of their position can be fairly determined.

Luke's account of the Apostolic Council, in the xvth chapter, is the passage that is specially entitled to attention, since it is here, as we are told, that the peculiar "tendency" of Luke is most palpably disclosed, and his violations of historical truth most apparent. The Tübingen critics do not scruple to declare that no such Council was held, no such concession made to the Gentiles by Peter, James, and John, and, on the contrary, that no such requirements were laid by them, with Paul's assent, upon the Gentile believers. The original Apostles were too strong Judaizers, Paul was too radical in the opposite direction, for us to suppose that either party would have consented to such an arrangement.

The first thing to be said in reply to these propositions is, that the main assertion of the negative criticism respecting the position of the three Apostles on the great question of the relation of the Gentile believers to the Mosaic Law, is demonstrably false. The Apostle Paul, in the second chapter of Galatians, referring to this very visit to Jerusalem during which the Council took place, declares that the Apostles had no amendment to propose to his preaching, but gave him the right hand of fellowship.[1] The three Apostles did not ask, or expect, that the Gentile converts should be circumcised. They gave him the hand of fellowship, although at that very time he refused to comply with the demand of Judaizers that Titus, his companion, a heathen convert, should receive circumcision. Paul's own statement, therefore, sweeps away the foundation of the Tübingen theory.[2]

[1] Gal. ii. 9.

[2] The Author of "Supernatural Religion," who reproduces the doctrines and arguments of the Tübingen school, says (vol. iii. p. 281):

To call in question the sincerity of this act of fellowship would involve the greatest reproach against both parties, the Three Apostles on the one side, and Paul and Barnabas on the other. Had the recognition of him not been real and cordial, Paul's reference to it, in writing to the Galatians, must be considered intentionally misleading. Finally, the arrangement for the collection of alms for the poor brethren at Jerusalem proves incontestably that there was mutual confidence and good feeling.[1]

There are two principal arguments brought against the credibility of Luke's narrative of the Council. The first is from the silence of the Apostle Paul respecting the Decree or Recommendation of the Council, in the Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, where the same, or cognate questions, are handled. Let us look, in the first place, at the Epistle to the Galatians. What was the difficulty in that Church? Judaizers were demanding that the Galatian Christians should be circumcised, and they were calling in question the apostolic authority of Paul, he not having been one of the twelve. These were the two points

"It will be observed that, after saying that they 'communicated nothing' to him, the Apostle adds, in opposition, 'but, on the contrary,' (ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον). In what does this opposition consist? Apparently in this, that, instead of strengthening the hands of Paul, they left him to labor alone." But what Paul says is: "On the contrary . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." The sense is: 'they found nothing to supply or correct in my teaching, but, on the contrary, gave me a pledge of friendship and fidelity.' The author of "Supernatural Religion" here adopts a flagrant misinterpretation, equal to the worst which he finds in the class of writers whom he is fond of stigmatizing as "Apologists."

[1] Gal. ii. 10. The author of "Supernatural Religion" (iii. 312) does "not think it worth while to refer" to this consideration, since "charity is not a mere matter of doctrine, and the Good Samaritan does not put a sufferer through the catechism." This will not do. Who can believe that the Three Apostles asked alms, for themselves or their brethren, of one whom they considered a heretic and perverter of the Gospel?

on which they were making trouble: the Galatians must be circumcised, and Paul was either no Apostle, or subordinate to the older Disciples. Now Paul says just what he would be expected to say, under the circumstances. He vindicates his independence as an Apostle, by showing just what his relations had been to those who were Apostles before him; and he meets the other point of the Judaizers at the same time, by referring to this identical visit to Jerusalem, when the three Apostles sanctioned his preaching, and made no claim that the Gentiles should submit to the initiatory rite of Judaism.[1] It is true that Paul refers to his private interview at Jerusalem with the other Apostles, but his phraseology implies that there was, also, a more public conference;[2] and to this private interview he would naturally refer, rather than to the public meeting, since his relation to the other Apostles in particular was the question uppermost in his mind.

In the other place where the silence of Paul as to the Conciliar conclusion is considered by the Tübingen critics inexplicable (1 Cor. viii.), the question respecting the eating of meat offered to idols was not raised by Judaizers. It was a subject that was brought before the Apostle's mind independently of any controversies about the re-

[1] The author of "Supernatural Religion" says (vol. iii. p. 269): "Is it possible that the Apostle would have left totally unmentioned the fact that the Apostles and the very Church of Jerusalem had actually declared circumcision to be unnecessary?" But this is just what Paul does say of the other Apostles, whose authority the Judaizers were attempting to array against him. They saw, he says, "that the Gospel of uncircumcision was committed unto me;" "they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship." What more explicit could the author of "Supernatural Religion" demand?

[2] See the comments of Meyer and Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 2. The *κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν* is in contrast with the previous *αὐτοῖς*, which denotes the larger body. How impossible, as Meyer says, that Paul should have made no communication except to the Three!

lation of Jewish to Gentile believers. He was not called upon, therefore, by the circumstances of the case to make any reference to the Conference at Jerusalem.

It is objected, however, secondly, that the teaching of Paul in his Epistles is contradictory to the prescriptions of the Council. The more common answer to this objection is that the Letter of the Council was addressed to the Gentile brethren in Syria, and Cilicia; and that the Apostle, after he had extended his work far beyond these limits, and planted churches mainly composed of Gentiles, did not consider himself at all bound to carry out those recommendations. This may possibly be a sufficient answer to the objection, and solution of the difficulty. Yet it is improbable, as we may infer from Acts xxi. 25, as well as from the apparent position of James and most of the Jewish Christians at the time of the Council, that they considered the restrictions to be of so limited application. It seems probable that they looked on these restrictions, not as dictated by expediency merely, in order that Jews might not be scandalized, but as intrinsically proper.[1] To ascertain what view Paul took on this subject, we must scrutinize their purport, and then inquire what was Paul's subsequent teaching as compared with them. From the conjunction of the restrictions of marriage as they stand in the Mosaic law (Levit. xviii.) with the other prohibitions which are reiterated in the Apostolic decree, and from the reference to the Balaamites and followers of Jezebel in the Apocalypse (Rev. ii. 14, 20), whose offence appears to have been a disregard of these enactments, it is certainly probable that, by fornication (*πορνεία*) is meant, or at least prominently included, the marriages thus forbidden. The Apostle (1 Cor. v. 1) in his reference to one who had taken his step-mother to wife, uses this term, having in mind the

[1] See below, p. 482 seq.

law in Lev. xviii. 8.[1] There is no doubt that Paul insisted upon the obligation which was expressed in the last prohibition of the Council. The first prohibition related to meat offered to idols, or slain in the heathen sacrifices. There is reason to believe, partly from the references in the Old Testament to practices of this nature, that the reference here was to the feasts spread in the heathen temples, in which Christians would be tempted to participate. This interpretation is favored by Ewald, who considers the restriction to be "a command to abstain from all idolatrous worship."[2] Reverting now to Paul's instruction to the Corinthians, we shall see that he inculcates this very obligation on Christians.[3] They are not to sit at meat in the idol's temple. With respect to the further question about eating in one's own house, or at a private meal, the flesh of an animal which had been offered on a heathen altar, and purchased in the market, the Apostle gives a qualified answer. The meat is not in reality tainted, or polluted; but if one superstitiously thinks it to be so, I ought not, by the force of my example, to lead him to violate his conscience, however it may lack enlightenment. The Apostle discusses the whole subject, as we should anticipate that he would, on the broad grounds of principle. But the result—the obligation to stay away from feasts in idol temples—is identical with what we suppose to be the drift and intent of the Conciliar recommendation. Nothing unfavorable to the historical truth of the latter can be drawn, therefore, from any inconsistency on this point in the subsequent teaching of Paul. The third restriction of the Council pertained to

[1] So Meyer, *in loc.* The previous husband was probably, in this case, still living (2 Cor. vii. 12.) On the term πορνεία in the Apostolic decree, see Ritschl, p. 129 sq., Lipsius, in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexicon.*

[2] Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, vi. 437.

[3] 1 Cor. x. 18-22.

the eating of the blood of animals; for the prohibition of blood and of things strangled is virtually one. "This," says Ewald, "was agreeable to all the better sentiment of antiquity, and was certainly at that time accepted as an obligation that no one disputed."[1] At the same time, as Ewald proceeds to say, this ancient view respecting blood had its root in a higher thought or association, by no means of necessity or inseparably connected with it.[2] Here there was room for new questions, and further strife. Ewald suggests that the neglect of the Gentile converts to take the requisite precautions in killing their meat, their failure to observe this restriction, induced the feeling among the Jewish Christians that they could not safely eat with them, and thus gave rise to the occurrences at Antioch when Paul rebuked Peter for his inconsistency. At all events, the Apostle Paul nowhere, in his Epistles, expresses dissent from this part of the Conciliar letter. This particular restriction appears to have dropped out of sight; since it is not mentioned in the Apocalypse, in the passage which probably alludes to the decree of the Council, and affords an additional proof of its historical reality.[3]

Thus, when we compare the xvth of Acts on the one hand, with the testimony and teaching of Paul on the other, we find no inconsistency between the two. On the capital fact of a fraternal recognition of Paul by the older Apostles, there is a perfect agreement. He could say that they added nothing to his teaching; for he had been accustomed to expect of his heathen converts a fulfillment of the duties resting upon a proselyte of the gate. The

[1] Geschichte, vi. 439.

[2] Alterthümer, p. 41. The first origin of the feeling was in the idea of the blood as the life, or soul, of the animal, and as having a sort of sacredness which precluded it from being a proper article of food for man.

[3] Rev. ii. 14.

concessions that were made by them were tantamount to a distinct admission that the observance of the law was not necessary for salvation.[1] The recommendations of the Council, Paul was not led by the circumstances under which he wrote to the Galatians and the Corinthians, to call up; but his teaching, as far as he touches on the topics in question, is coincident with them.

There are certain considerations which strongly corroborate Luke's narrative of the Council.

1. The liberality of Peter subsequently in eating with the Gentiles at Antioch presupposes previous convictions on his part such as are attributed to him by Luke. Had he been a stiff Judaizer, the instantaneous sweeping away of all barriers between him and the Gentile—such even as the decision of the Council left untouched—would be utterly inexplicable.

2. It is altogether unlikely from all that we know of James that he and his associates would have been satisfied, at the time of the Council, with less than what is contained in the prescriptions of the decree. We know from Paul's own testimony that they assured him of their fellowship, and bestowed, as it were, their benediction upon his work. Did they do this, making no requirements of the Gentile converts? Not even requiring the observance of what was expected of Proselytes of the Gate? The supposition is in-

[1] The Author of "Supernatural Religion" (iii. 268), speaking of the stipulation that Paul should remember the poor at Jerusalem, says: "As one condition is here mentioned, why not the others, had any been actually imposed?" The request that the Gentile Christians should contribute to the necessities of the poor at Jerusalem, is not properly called "a condition,"—as if the recognition of Paul and his mission depended upon it. But there were no other conditions; that is, none which went beyond the previous opinions and practices of Paul. The provisions of the decree were not something "added," in the sense in which he uses the term.

credible. This consideration lends the strongest probability to the transaction which Luke records.

3. No Pauline Christian of the second century, after the Gospel had spread far and wide among the heathen, would have proposed that the Jewish Christians should continue to observe the whole Mosaic law.[1] The Church had passed beyond concessions of this kind. Yet this is the position assigned, throughout the Book of Acts, to James and his Apostolic associates. It is nothing different from what we might expect of both classes of Christians while the temple was still standing, and while the stronghold of Christianity, so to speak, was at Jerusalem. To place an understanding or arrangement of this kind in the second century is an anachronism.

In the controversy afterwards at Antioch, Peter was not accused by Paul of holding Judaizing principles, but rather of a temporary desertion of the liberal ground which he had occupied before the arrival of the messengers from Jerusalem. The conduct of Peter as thus disclosed, therefore, so far from casting discredit upon Luke's account of his behaviour at the Council, corroborates that narrative. Let it be observed that the complaint of those who came from James—we know not the special errand on which they came—was, not that the Antioch converts from the heathen side were not circumcised, but that the Jewish Christians mingled with them at a common table, paying no heed to the restrictions of the law. This was a point not expressly touched by the decision of the Council, and one on which a difference might easily exist. In other words, that decision left a door open for further controversy with regard to the kind and degree of intercourse that should subsist between the two classes of believers.[2]

[1] See Mangold's remarks, in Bleek's *Einl.* p. 392.

[2] This topic is further considered in Ch. xv. of this work. The Author

It may be here remarked that a strong confirmation of the fidelity of Luke's narrative is found in the special characteristics and position ascribed respectively to Peter and James. Both are Jewish Apostles, and in the main coincide; yet James appears throughout as more conservative, more sedulous to prevent the Jewish Christians from giving up the distinctive peculiarities of the ritual.

The refusal of Paul to circumcise Titus at the demand of "the false brethren" was not inconsistent with what is said of Timothy in Acts xvi. 3. The two cases were not parallel. Titus was of Greek parentage on both sides; Timothy's mother was a Jewess, as Luke expressly states (Acts xvi. 1).[1] The circumcision of Titus was demanded by Judaizers, on doctrinal grounds; the circumcision of Timothy was an accommodation to the feeling of Jews (Acts xvi. 3), that he might have access to the synagogues, without having to encounter a hostile prejudice. In the circumcision of Timothy, Paul acted, whatever may be said to the contrary,[2] agreeably to his avowed maxim, to avoid all offence where no principle was at stake.[3] It

of "Supernatural Religion" thinks that the proceedings at Antioch show that James, and those who were sent by him, held a position opposite to that assigned to them in Luke's description of the Council. But he answers himself when he compares the relation of the Gentile Christians to the Jewish, as defined by the Council, to that of "Proselytes of the Gate in relation to Judaism" (vol. iii. p. 282). This statement may be correct so far as it describes the views which many Jewish Christians took of the bearing of the decree upon the mutual intercourse of the two classes of Christians. The Gentile Christians were not recognized by them as "in full communion" (*Sup. Rel.*, iii. 283). This was the point of dispute at Antioch. But they were recognized as "fellow-heirs" of salvation through Christ.

[1] Notwithstanding Meyer's comment, it seems probable that the Jews who knew the family would think that the rite ought to have been applied, and, at the same time—his father being a Greek—knew that this had not been done.

[2] As by the Author of "Supernatural Religion" (iii. 301).

[3] 1 Cor. ix. 19–23.

is true that he says: "Is any called in uncircumcision, let him not be circumcised."[1] But a great strain is put upon a general declaration of this character, when it is inferred that the Apostle could, therefore, never have allowed this rite in the case of a missionary helper, whose mother was a Jewess, and whose circumcision carried with it no doctrinal significance, but removed a harmful prejudice.[2]

The assailants of the credibility of Luke make much of an alleged parallelism, according to the Acts, between the miracles and experiences of the two Apostles Peter and Paul. It can hardly fail, however, to occur to every one who reflects, that there must have been striking points of resemblance in the events incidental to the career of men engaged in the same work, and in the face of similar obstacles.[3] There were sick to be healed, blasphemers to be chastised; there would be visions to be received, and imprisonments and deliverances to be experienced, by both. Without doubt, the two Apostles are the leading personages in the narrative. Nor does it justify a suspicion of untruthfulness, if there are found, or even if the author, in the selection of his material, takes pains to present, incidents which exhibit such a resemblance. If Peter healed a man lame from his birth at the gate of the temple at Jerusalem,[4] it is surely not, for this reason, incredible, that at Lystra another such cripple should be healed by Paul.[5] Because Ananias and Sapphira are punished by Peter,[6] why should it be thought incredible that Elymas, "the sorcerer," should be smitten with blindness by Paul?[7] Because Cornelius fell at the feet of Peter, and Peter bade

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 18.

[2] Dr. Lightfoot thinks that Paul, in Gal. ii. 3, is answering an objection founded on the known fact of the circumcision of Timothy. See Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 104.

[3] Cf. Gal. ii. 8. [4] Acts iii. 2 seq. [5] xiv. 8 seq. [6] v. 1 seq.

[7] xiii. 11 seq.

him rise,[1] it is a groundless skepticism to doubt the statement that the people at Lystra would have offered sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas.[2] And what shall be said of the suspicion awakened by the circumstance that while Peter is "scourged by order of the council,[3] Paul is beaten with many stripes at the command of the magistrates of Philippi?"[4] The mistrust that dictates the impeachment of Luke is so purely subjective that it admits of no explicit refutation. All that can be said is that the incidents are such as might naturally occur, in the course of the labors of an Apostle, and present no greater degree of resemblance, in the two cases, than might be expected.

Equally groundless is the critical attack upon the authenticity of the speeches contained in the Acts, and the charge that they were invented by the Author. That the language is, in the main, the Author's is conceded, since some of them were made in the Aramaic; for example, the address of Paul to the mob at Jerusalem.[5] Most of them are condensed; none of them, as recorded, would occupy in the delivery, more than six minutes.[6] Of course this condensation would involve a substitution, to a considerable extent, of Luke's own phraseology for that of the several speakers.[7] Beyond these necessary changes, there is no reason to impute a lack of correctness to the reports of the speeches; much less, to make them the product of a wholesale invention. The verbal resemblances which are brought forward to sustain this imputation are quite inconclusive. Stephen says (Acts viii. 2):—

[1] x. 25, 26. [2] xiv. 13 seq. [3] v. 40.

[4] xvi. 22, seq. "Supernatural Religion," iii. 71.

[5] Acts xxii. See Acts xxi. 40. [6] Reuss, *Einl., in d. N. T.*, p. 207.

[7] The Author of "Supernatural Religion" (Vol. iii. ch. 3) expends much space in a comparison of the vocabulary of the speeches with the language of the Book elsewhere. It is a characteristic effort to prove what is not disputed.

"Men, brethren, fathers, hear." Paul, in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, is addressed by the rulers (Acts xiii. 15): "Men, brethren . . . . . say on;" and Paul thereupon thus begins: "Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, hear." This is one of the instances relied upon to prove that the speeches were invented by Luke.[1] It might as well be inferred that the reports of speeches in the House of Commons are invented by the editors of the newspapers in which they appear, because they begin with "Mr. Speaker;" or that the speeches of lawyers in the courts are composed by the reporter, since they so often open with "Gentlemen of the Jury." As regards the contents of the speeches in the Acts, it is altogether probable that in the first addresses of the Apostles to Jewish auditors, there would be a reference to the guilt involved in the crucifixion, and to the proof of the Messiahship of Jesus which was furnished by His resurrection; and that certain passages in the Prophets would be habitually referred to as verified in the conduct of the Jews, and in the life and death of Jesus. There is no greater similarity in the substance of these addresses than would naturally be expected under the circumstances.[2] When we study them individually, we find in some of them convincing proof of

[1] "Supernatural Religion," iii. 160.

[2] The Author of "Supernatural Religion," who is quite confident in his accusations under this head, might find a confutation in his own remarks, in the same volume, upon alleged quotations from the Acts, in the Pastor of Hermas, Ignatius, and some other writers. "There was in fact no formula more current either amongst the Jews or in the early Church;" "A formula is employed which is common throughout the New Testament;" "Along with much similarity, there is likewise divergence between these sentences;" "He simply sets forth from the prophets, direct, the doctrines which formed the great text of the early church" (vol. iii. 8, 9, 13, 17),—these are a few of the statements, some of which are well founded, by the same Author in reference to coincidences which he wishes to prove to be accidental.

authenticity. The whole spirit and tenor of the discourse of Stephen (Acts vii.), especially when it is considered in relation to the accusation of blasphemy against the law and the temple, to which he was replying, have the strongest verisimilitude. How natural is the gradually rising indignation which is kindled in his mind by the rehearsal of the long disobedience of the Jews! As he follows this course of iniquity down to the final act, the destruction of "the Just One," his indignation bursts forth at last in a stream of denunciation. The farewell of Paul to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 18-35) abounds in expressions characteristic of the Apostle. Its whole tone is a testimony to its genuineness. "Ye yourselves know that these hands have ministered to my necessities"[1]—we can almost see the gesture with which these words were accompanied. Paul's speech on Mars Hill (Acts xvii. 22-31), in its choice of topics, in its conciliatory introduction, in the manner in which the way is paved for the final declaration respecting the judgment and resurrection,[2] is marked by originality, and by a character fully accordant with what we should expect from the Apostle. How entirely gratuitous, and without proof, is the assertion that this speech was manufactured by the historian!

The theory of a tendency, or doctrinal purpose, in Luke, impelling him to substitute fictions for facts, is confuted by his omission to avail himself of the most ready opportunities for securing the end which he is assumed to have been pursuing. One or two instances may be specified. There is a difficulty about the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, when according to Luke (xi. 30) they carried to the brethren there the alms of the Antioch Christians; since Paul does not mention this visit, as we should expect him to do, in Galatians ii. It has been suggested as one

[1] Ver. 34. [2] Ver. 31.

possible and not unreasonable solution, that Paul was, for some cause, prevented from entering the city, or failed to meet the other Apostles. But the Tübingen critics are not content with any explanation of this sort; they are not even willing to allow that Luke made a mistake; but their sharp eyes discover a deliberate intention having for its motive a desire to bring Paul and the other Apostles together as often as possible! Under the simplest statement, their "optical infirmity," as Neander somewhere calls it, detects a deep plan of deception. It is surely most remarkable, if Luke made up this story, that he makes no mention of an interview between Paul and the other Apostles. He barely states that he went to Jerusalem, and went back again. We are asked to believe that the Evangelist invented the whole tale of a famine, and of the sympathy excited at Antioch, merely for the purpose of saying in the fewest and baldest terms that Paul went to Jerusalem! How much farther can this credulity, born of suspicion, go? If Luke was intent upon the object ascribed to him, why does he not record and embellish the fact, mentioned by Paul himself, of his stay for fifteen days with Peter? This is a fact which a writer actuated by the design attributed to Luke, would infallibly have laid hold of, and turned to account. Paul and Peter together for a fortnight in the same dwelling! What an opportunity would this afford for weaving fictions of the kind which the Evangelist is accused of fabricating! Then, why did the Author neglect to bring Paul and Peter together at last at Rome, where, according to the tradition, both perished as martyrs? Why throw away so fair an occasion for the furtherance of his scheme of exhibiting the two leading Apostles in amity one with another?

If Luke's omissions are incompatible with the fraudulent purpose with which he is credited, so, also, are numer-

ous features actually introduced into his narrative. If, as is alleged, he is bent upon elevating Paul, why does he, at the very outset, record the fact that a new Apostle was chosen in the room of Judas, in order to make up the number of twelve, and why does he set down the speech of Peter in which the necessity for this act is explained? Such a proceeding on the part of the Author of the Acts is incomprehensible upon the Tübingen hypothesis respecting his aim. By such an act he would stultify himself. One of the most signal examples of a mode of writing utterly incompatible with that hypothesis, is presented in the xxist chapter. Luke, it is said, labors to represent the Jewish Christians in a fraternal relation to Paul, and to cover up the antagonism which, it is affirmed, subsisted between them. This, we are assured, is a main end for which the book was written. This motive gives rise, it is claimed, to numerous distortions of fact, and not a few downright fictions. Now, in the xxist chapter, Luke records the statement of James to the effect that the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem, many thousands in number, were prejudiced against Paul, their ears having been filled with the story that he was trying to lead the Jews to give up Moses. Here Luke sets down the very last thing he would have been willing to mention, if the Tübingen judgment of him had any good foundation. One would think that this passage would strike the critics dumb. The only thing they are able to say is, that Luke forgets his part, and brings out the truth unwittingly! Yet in this very narrative—for instance, in the account of the origin of the mob against Paul—it is maintained that Luke has artfully perverted the facts for the purpose of concealing the antipathy of the Jewish Christians towards the Apostle to the Gentiles! He must have been on the watch, then; he must have written with deliberation. The

Tübingen solution of the difficulty, weak enough at the best, is stripped of every vestige of plausibility by the imputations with which it is coupled.

There is one argument for the genuineness and credibility of the book of Acts, which must carry an almost irresistible force to every unprejudiced mind. It is drawn from the relation of the Acts to the Pauline Epistles. The undesigned coincidences between the two authorities have been skilfully pointed out by Paley, in the *Horæ Paulinæ*. They constitute a special source of evidence of great weight. But to this branch of proof we do not now refer. It is obvious to the student of the New Testament that the Acts was written independently of the Epistles. The great effort of the Tübingen critics is to point out discrepancies, and to convict Luke of something worse than gross inaccuracy, by an appeal to statements that lie on the face of the Epistles. This attempt we deem to be a total failure, and have given reasons for this opinion. But so much is indisputably true, that the book of Acts, is, in no sense, framed on the basis of the Epistles, by the use of the historical statements contained in them. There is no trace of an endeavor on the part of Luke to fit his narrative to these other documents. Is is, throughout, an independent book. Now if a writer in the second century, or at the close of the first, had set out to construct artificially a history of the Apostles, for such a purpose as that imputed to Luke, it is incredible that he should have left aside in this way the Pauline and other Apostolic Epistles. These were in the hands of the churches for which his book was intended, and on which he wished to produce a certain impression. How impossible that he should not make it his first business to dove-tail his artificial narrative into these other familiar documents of recognized authority! If the book of Acts had been written as Baur and Zeller say it was

written, they would have found no such material out of which to construct their plausible, but sophistical arguments against its credibility. Paul's sojourn in Arabia would not have been left out, his journeys to Jerusalem would have tallied palpably with those noticed in the Epistle to the Galatians, and on a great variety of points we should hear the echoes of the statements made by the Apostle himself in his acknowledged writings. The phenomena are just what we should expect if the book was written at no great interval after the events recorded in it, and by one who drew his knowledge partly from personal observation, and partly from oral representation, emanating from others. The phenomena are not at all such as we should confidently expect if the Author, at a later epoch, with the Epistles of Paul in his hands, had sat down to compose an artificial narrative for a partisan, or doctrinal purpose.

The book of Acts, though it does not conclude abruptly, breaks off at an interesting point in the history. We can account for the hurried, condensed ending of the Gospel of Luke, by supposing that he was intending to compose another work, the Acts, in which the intercourse of Jesus with His Disciples after His Resurrection is more fully stated. The manner in which this second book ends is not due to the fact that it was written at the point where the narrative terminates, since its date is later than that of the Gospel. Moreover, no details are given about the life of Paul during the two years which, as the Author states, he spent at Rome. A hundred reasons might be imagined to account for this. Luke may have been ill, or may have died, and thus have been prevented from executing his plan. But the conclusion of the Acts, before the death of Paul or of Peter, has suggested the plausible supposition that he may have intended to compose a third work,

but may have been precluded from carrying out his purpose.[1]

From an historical point of view, a distinction is to be made between that portion of Luke's narrative in which he speaks as an eye-witness, and even as an actor in the transactions which he records, and that part of the work in which he presents information which he has obtained from others. As far as this portion of the work is concerned, the materials of which were gained by inquiry, it stands precisely on a level with his Gospel. It is to be remembered, in reference to both books, that they emanate from a trusted acquaintance of the Apostle Paul. Their statements are to be tested and elucidated by comparison with the Apostolic Epistles. The date of the third Gospel, as will be shown, is about the year 70. The date of the Acts, we infer from the introduction, and from other evidence, was not many years later. We shall not be very wide of the mark, if we place it at A. D. 80.

Luke, like every other writer, has his own style. A certain rhetorical manner is not unfrequently manifest, which readily explains itself to any one versed in literary criticism. When, for example, he makes James say that many "myriads"—tens of thousands—of Jewish Christians, were in Jerusalem, no one would understand it as a strictly statistical statement.[2] So when he says that "all" of the believers at Jerusalem sold their houses and lands, the statement is qualified by incidental remarks afterwards, which imply that there were still possessors of private property.[3] In the account of the private consultation of the Sanhedrim upon the case of Peter and John, Luke makes the members put their heads together, and say to one another that it is useless to deny the miracle wrought by

[1] Meyer, *Apostelgeschichte, Einl.*, p. 14.

[2] Acts xxi. 20.

[3] Acts ii. 45.

the Apostles, since the fact is manifest to all Jerusalem; but that the further spread of the fact among the people must be prevented by silencing the Apostles (Acts iv. 16). It has been objected that the members of the Sanhedrim would hardly make such an admission to one another in so bald a form. But, in such a case, as Neander suggests, a writer like Luke might naturally give to the process of reasoning which prompted the act of the Sanhedrim, he might give to the motives that influenced them, the form of a verbal statement, or conversation.[1] They took a certain course, and consciously for this reason. Luke's report of the speeches of the Apostles and of others is marked, as we have said, by verisimilitude. They speak in character. There are expressions in Paul's speeches which are evidently transmitted with literal fidelity. Yet the art of phonographic reporting did not exist. Condensation might often be necessary in the records of such addresses. And the fact that no strictly verbal report is attempted, is proved by the style, which has the characteristic vocabulary of Luke. Luke, in relating the mortal illness with which Herod was seized, after an act of signal impiety, says that an angel smote him (Acts xii. 23). He does not mean that an angel was visibly present. There was a special act of Providence, a judgment of the Almighty; and the supernatural element is thus conceived and described by the historian. The passage, when it is carefully considered, may throw light upon other events which are connected by Luke with the intervention, or instrumentality, of angels.

These remarks pertain to the interpretation of the Author. They do not touch his faithfulness and credibility. The attack of the recent critics is founded upon a subjective and narrow conception of the contents of Christ's teaching,

[1] Plant. and Train. of the Ch., p. 41.

and upon an untenable hypothesis relative to the doctrinal position of the Judæo-Christian Apostles. It is sustained by means of sophistical exegesis. The imagined "tendency" of Luke, it is not unfrequently found necessary to say, is a tendency in the other direction. Hence the various notions of an "Ur-Lukas," and of a mingling of heterogeneous documents,—notions which cannot stand the test of a critical examination. A larger view of the subject, and a fairer treatment of the Author, would save the critics from committing themselves to the advocacy of these crude and short-lived hypotheses.

CHAPTER X.

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

A GENERATION has elapsed since the discussion of the authenticity of the Gospel which is traditionally ascribed to John, was commenced by Ferdinand Christian Baur and his associates of the Tübingen school. We may review the case as it now stands, in light of the evidence and arguments which have been adduced in the progress of this long and active controversy.[1]

It is well agreed that down to a quite modern date the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel was undisputed. It is true that Epiphanius speaks of an insignificant sect, whom he names Alogi, who were found in Asia Minor, especially at Thyatira, probably not much later than A. D. 150, and who rejected this Gospel.[2] But it is clear that their leading motive was a theological prejudice, with which, to be sure, they connected certain other objections growing out of a comparison of this Gospel with the other three. But they rejected the Apocalypse, as well as the Gospel; and as they attributed the latter to Cerinthus, a contemporary of John at Ephesus, their opposition rather tells for, than against, its genuineness. As Zeller concedes,[3] no

[1] For the literature, see Mr. Gregory's App. to the Engl. Transl. of Luthardt's *Der johanneische Ursprung d. 4tn Evang.* (Leipsic, 1874).

[2] *Hær*, li. c. 3. 28; liv., 1; cf. Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* III. ii. 9, and Philastrius, *Hær.*, 60.

[3] Theol. Jahrb., 1845, p. 645 seq.

evidence can be derived from this unimportant sect for the existence of another tradition as to the authorship of the Gospel than that which connects it with the Apostle.

The strongest consideration, as far as external proof is concerned, centres in Polycarp and in the relations of Irenæus to this Father. Polycarp died as a martyr, it is now ascertained, in A. D. 155.[1] Since at that time he had been "eighty and six years in the Lord," his birth was as early as A. D. 69. His high standing and wide influence are fully attested, independently of all questions pertaining to this Gospel. Situated as he was, and having, as we shall see, personally known the Apostle John, it is plain that if we had the testimony of Polycarp to the Johannine authorship of the Gospel, nothing more nor higher in the way of historical proof could be desired. Such direct and formal testimony we have not; but it may be true, nevertheless, that we have what is fully equivalent to it. The only extant writing of Polycarp is an Epistle to the Philippians, which, among various expressions which are evidently derived from the Epistles of Paul, and other New Testament books, introduces a statement that occurs almost *verbatim* in the first Epistle of John?[2] The common authorship of the Gospel and Epistle is a well-established fact. The genuineness of Polycarp's Epistle, which is attested by Irenæus,[3] and is not without strong internal evidence in its support,[4] ought not to be questioned. Yet, as it is called in question by some, and as the source of the passage in Polycarp, to which we have referred, cannot be demonstrated to be the First Epistle of John, although an

[1] Waddington, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscript. et Belles Lettres*, tome xxvi., P. 2, p. 232 seq.

[2] Polycarp, *Philippians*, vii. (1 John iv. 3).

[3] See cc. v. and vi., where only two classes of ministers in the Philippian Church are mentioned, presbyters and deacons.

[4] Adv. Hær. III. iii. 4.

unbiased judgment would hardly doubt that such was its origin, we would not insist on this quotation as conclusively proving the acquaintance of Polycarp with the Johannine writings.

The proof of this fact rests mainly on the relation of Irenæus to Polycarp, and on the inferences which we are necessitated to draw from it. Irenæus was himself a native of Asia Minor, where he spent his youth. In 177, he became Bishop of Lyons, where he had previously been a Presbyter. We shall not be far out of the way if we set the date of his birth at 130.[1] From the pen of Irenæus we have reminiscences of his intercourse with Polycarp. Florinus, one of the associates of Irenæus in his youth, subsequently embraced the Gnostic heresy. Irenæus addressed to him a letter, from which the following is an extract[2]:—

Those opinions, Florinus, that I may speak in mild terms, are not of sound doctrine; those opinions are not in agreement with the Church, and involve those who adopt them in the deepest impiety; those opinions not even the heretics outside of the Church have ever ventured to broach; those opinions the elders who were before us, who were the pupils of the Apostles, did not deliver to you. For while I was still a boy, I saw you in Lower Asia, with Polycarp, when you were in a brilliant position in the royal palace, and strove to approve yourself to him. For I recall better what occurred at that time than I do recent events, since what we learned in childhood, being united to the soul as it grows up, becomes incorporated with it, so that I can even describe the place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit and discourse, his goings out, too, and his comings in, the manner of his life and form of his body, and his discourses which he used to deliver to the people, and how he spoke of his familiar intercourse with John and with the rest of those who had heard the Lord, and how he would call to mind their words. And whatever things he had heard from them respecting the Lord, both as to His miracles and His teaching, just as Polycarp had received it from the eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, he recounted it agreeably to the

[1] See Mr. C. J. H. Ropes's thorough Article, *Irenæus of Lyons* (*Bib. Sacra*, April 1877).

[2] *Epist. ad Flor.* ii. (Stieren's ed. i. 822).

Scriptures. These things, through the mercy of God which was upon me, I diligently heard, and treasured them up, not on paper, but in my heart; and I am continually, by the grace of God, revolving these things in my mind; and I can bear witness before God that, if that blessed and apostolic elder had ever heard any such thing, he would have cried out and stopped his ears, saying, as he was wont to say: "Good God! unto what times hast Thou reserved me that I should endure these things?" And he would have fled from the very place, whether sitting or standing, had he heard such words.

In his copious work on Heresies, Irenæus speaks at some length of his personal relations to Polycarp:[1]—

But Polycarp, also, was not only instructed by the Apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by Apostles in Asia, appointed bishop of the church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried (on earth) a very long time, and, when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the Apostles, and which the church has handed down, and which alone are true. To these things all the Asiatic churches testify, as do also those men who have succeeded Polycarp down to the present time,—a man who was of much greater weight, and a more steadfast witness of truth, than Valentinus, and Marcion, and the rest of the heretics. He it was who, coming to Rome in the time of Anicetus, caused many to turn away from the aforesaid heretics to the Church of God, proclaiming that he had received this one and sole truth from the Apostles,—that, namely, which is handed down by the Church. There are, also, those who heard from him that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-house without bathing, exclaiming, "Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within." And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion, and said, "Dost thou know me?" "I do know thee, the first-born of Satan." Such was the horror which the Apostles and their disciples had against holding even a verbal communication with any corrupters of the truth; as Paul also says, "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." There is also a very powerful epistle of Polycarp written to the Philippians, from which those who choose to do so, and are anxious about their salvation, can learn the character of his faith, and the preaching of the truth. Then, again,

[1] Adv. Hær., iii. 3, 4.

the Church at Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John remaining among them permanently until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the Apostles.

Again, in a Letter of Irenæus to Victor, Bishop of Rome, a fragment of which remains, there is a reference to a visit of Polycarp to Rome (between A. D. 150 and A. D. 155), when Anicetus was Bishop there, and to the appeal then made by Polycarp to the instruction which he had received from John and other Apostles.[1] Elsewhere, Irenæus frequently refers to the elders, disciples of the Apostles, from whom he had received information. In these passages, the term "elder" does not denote an office; but the "elders" are the Fathers—worthies of a preceding time. His authorities were those who had directly conversed with the Apostles, or such as the pupils of the Apostles had taught.[2] Especially through his acquaintance with Polycarp, he was separated by only a single link from the Apostle John. These extracts from Irenæus need no comment. They discover to us the associations in which he stood in his youth. With Irenæus, the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is a fact perfectly familiar, and above all question. He even argues fancifully that there must be four, and only four, Gospels, finding analogies in the four winds, and the four quarters of the globe.[3] This only shows how free from every shadow of doubt was his confidence in the authenticity of the Gospels acknowledged by the Church.

Now is it supposable that Irenæus, and his contemporaries with him, received this Gospel as the work of the Apostle John, without doubt or question, while Polycarp,

[1] *Frag.* iii., Stieren's ed., p. 824 seq.

[2] *Adv. Hær.* ii. 22, 5 (cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 23), iii. 1, 1 (cf. Euseb., *H. E.* v. 8), iii. 3, 4 (cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, iv. 14), v. 30, 1 (cf. Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 8), v. 33, 3, v. 33, 4.

[3] Adv. Hær. iii. 12, 8.

John's pupil and their teacher, was either ignorant of its existence, or rejected it? The testimony of Irenæus virtually involves in it the testimony of the Teacher who lived until Irenæus had grown up to manhood. Polycarp was a representative man. That he received a Gospel as from John which the bishops and churches about him rejected, cannot for a moment be supposed. Had a conflict of this kind existed, the sound of it would have reverberated far and wide. The testimony of Irenæus takes us back into the circle of "Elders," to whom the Apostle John had been personally known, and who were able to describe his looks, and report his words. There is nothing in the character of Irenæus, or in his habits of mind, to weaken the value of the evidence which he affords on a point of this nature. He may be faulty in his taste, as in his reference to cosmical analogies for the quadruple character of the Gospel history. But this carries no impeachment of his veracity. Though not a man of very remarkable powers, he is far from being weak. He is no dreamer. Instead of being addicted to speculation, he represents the practical tendency in theology. Against all innovators, he perpetually holds up the doctrine transmitted by the Apostles in the churches which they had planted. He rests always upon the historical argument. But the main fact in the case is his own unquestioning acceptance of the Fourth Gospel as the work of John, taken in connection with his relations to Polycarp. And this fact stands, be his special intellectual qualities what they may.

Occasionally, it is true, he falls into error in accepting traditions. There are only three instances which are worthy of note; and an attention to them will show that they afford no ground for distrusting the statements which we have cited from his pen. Alluding to the parting of Paul from the elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 17 seq.), he

speaks of them as the elders and bishops of Ephesus and the neighboring places;[1] as if the precedence of the bishop over his associate elders had existed at that early day in the several churches. Considering the way in which the precedence of the bishop over the presbyters arose, that this arrangement was not a sudden creation, but grew up by little and little, it is not strange that Irenæus should have thus antedated the episcopal system. Irenæus states that the book of Revelation was written in the reign of Domitian, late in the first century.[2] The better opinion among scholars now is, that it was composed earlier, shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. This is a particular point of chronology in which an error might easily become involved in the tradition,—a point which Irenæus would not be led to investigate. A stranger mistake is made when he affirms that Jesus lived to be nearly fifty years of age.[3] This opinion is the more unexpected, since he is familiar with the succession of events in the Saviour's life, and says that he thrice attended the Passover at Jerusalem.[4] But the conversation recorded by John (viii. 57), in which the Jews said to Jesus: "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?"—early suggested the quite unwarrantable inference that Jesus was then near that age. It was probably imagined that an interval occurred between His baptism, and His public ministry. This notion, be it observed, was derived from a passage found in John alone; and this goes to show the presence of the Gospel among those with whom Irenæus was early familiar. Instances of an adoption by Irenæus, of errors of this sort which had become mingled in the stream of tradition, even were they more numerous

[1] Adv. Hær., iii. 14, 2: "Convocatis episcopis et presbyteris," etc.
[2] Adv. Hær., v. 30, 3.
[3] Adv. Hær., ii. 22, 5.
[4] Ibid. ii. 22, 3.

instead of being few in number, would not seriously affect the value of his testimony upon the great matter which we are now considering. Here is a book having the strongly marked peculiarities of the Fourth Gospel, a book which must have been recognized as the production of John by Polycarp, his immediate disciple, an influential bishop in the very region where the Apostle had lived and labored. If John did not write it, how could such a work emerge into existence, and find a universal acceptance in the region where the Apostle had lived, and among those who had personally known him, and heard his teaching? We might as reasonably suppose that one of the earthquakes, not unfrequent in that region, occurred without the notice of the inhabitants.

Keim, the author of the "History of Jesus," thinks himself able to invalidate the testimony of Irenæus, and even to make it appear that the Apostle John never lived in Asia Minor at all. Eusebius, referring to a statement of Irenæus that Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, was a hearer of John, says that Papias himself, in the preface of his work, does not claim to be this; and Eusebius intimates that Irenæus may have misunderstood in this particular the passage which he proceeds to quote from Papias, and in which John the Presbyter, a second John, is mentioned, as well as John the Apostle.[1] Of John the Presbyter, Eusebius adds, Papias elsewhere states himself to have been a hearer. The construction which Eusebius puts upon the passage cited from Papias is unquestionably correct. It does not imply that he was, or that he was not, a hearer of the Apostle. On the ground of this remark of Eusebius, Keim leaps to the inference that Irenæus confounded John the Apostle with the Presbyter of the same name, and would persuade us that it was the Presbyter

[1] *H. E.* iii. 39.

to whom Polycarp referred in the discourses about John of which Irenæus speaks. He thinks that his theory is confirmed by the circumstance that Irenæus quotes from Papias, "the hearer of John" [the Apostle], a passage about the millennium which, as Keim avers, Eusebius refers to to the Presbyter. This extraordinary theory of Keim has found little applause even in the skeptical school of critics, few of whom are disposed to give up the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse; and it has been confuted satisfactorily by Hilgenfeld.[1] It may be well, however, to comment upon it briefly. First, it is not at all certain that Eusebius is right in thinking Irenæus mistaken with regard to Papias. Irenæus does not say that he found out from the preface of Papias that he was a hearer of the Apostle. He may have ascertained it in some other way. Eusebius, it should be observed, has a strong dislike to Papias on account of his millennial notions. Secondly, whether Irenæus misunderstood an expression of Papias, or not, and even if Papias were not a hearer of the Apostle—we do not know in what place, how far from Ephesus, Papias spent his youth—it is a monstrous violation of logic to infer that Irenæus misunderstood Polycarp, whom he personally knew, and whose discourses he had himself heard. Thirdly, it is not true that Eusebius attributes to the Presbyter the millennial notions of Papias. On the contrary he says that Papias misunderstood "the apostolical narratives."[2] The passages which we have quoted at length from Irenæus are not the only references to Polycarp's acquaintance with the Apostle. Irenæus relates the anecdote of John's fleeing from Cerinthus in the bath, as a fact which, not he himself, but others had learned from Polycarp.[3] These informants of Irenæus, we must also

[1] Einl. in d. N. T., p. 394 seq.
[2] H. E. iii. 39
[3] Adv. Hær., iii. 3. 4 (Euseb., *H. E.* iv. 14).

suppose, blundered equally with himself, if another John was meant. In discussing a passage in the Apocalypse, he refers to the testimony of "those men who saw John face to face."[1] Elsewhere he refers to "the elders"—more than one—who had seen the Apostle.[2] In his Letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, he refers to the intercourse of Polycarp and Anicetus, in which Polycarp had refused to yield up his opinion on the Passover question, "because John, the Disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the Apostles with whom he had associated" had sanctioned the Asiatic usage.[3] Fourthly, Polycarp is not the only witness to the sojourn of the Apostle in Asia. Apollonius, an Asiatic bishop in the second century, who wrote against the Montanists, an earlier writer than Irenæus, is another witness to the residence of the Apostle at Ephesus.[4] Polycrates, himself a Bishop of Ephesus who, at the time of his controversy with Victor of Rome, was "sixty-five years in the Lord," who was born, therefore, as early as A. D. 125, gives the same testimony as Irenæus respecting John's residence in Asia.[5] Clement of Alexandria was likewise well acquainted with circumstances connected with John's ministry and death in Asia.[6] Justin Martyr and all others, who attributed the Apocalypse to the Apostle, virtually testify to the same fact. Those who, like Keim, suppose that the author of the Gospel—whoever he may have been—proceeded on the supposition that John had lived in Asia Minor, cannot reasonably deny this fact. So that as early as from A. D. 110 to A. D. 120, by the confession of these critics, the belief must have prevailed in that region that the Apostle had lived and died there. Nothing more need be said in reply to a conjecture so baseless, and so at variance with strong and multiplied historical proofs.

[1] Ibid., v. 30, 1. [2] Ibid., v. 33. [3] Euseb. *H. E.*, v. 24.
[4] Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 18. [5] Ibid., iii. 31. [6] Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 23.

We may connect with the evidence drawn from Irenæus for the Johannine authorship, testimony from two other sources nearly contemporary with him, but widely separated both from him and from one another, in place. The first is the Muratorian Fragment on the Canon, which says: "The Fourth of the Gospels is the work of John, one of the Disciples"—in contrast with Luke and Mark, who are mentioned just before. "Exhorted by his fellow-disciples and bishops, he said: 'Fast with me to-day for three days, and let us relate to each other what has been revealed to each of us.' On the same night, it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should in his own name write down everything (cuncta describeret), and all should certify" (recognoscentibus cunctis).

Clement of Alexandria, reporting the tradition as to the order of the Gospels, which had come to him from the oldest Presbyters, says that "last of all, John, perceiving that in the other Gospels those things were related which pertained to bodily things (*τὰ σωματικά*), being encouraged by his familiar friends, and urged by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual Gospel."[1]

Say what we will of the details of these traditions, they contain a strong attestation to the main fact of the composition of the Gospel by John.

But we have proofs farther back in the second century. The evidence of a use of the Fourth Gospel by Justin Martyr, especially as drawn from the passage respecting regeneration,[2] is not weakened by verbal inaccuracies of

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, vi. 14. On these passages, Mr. Matthew Arnold (*God and the Bible*, p. 248) constructs a theory that the Ephesian Presbytery made over a book of which John furnished the materials, or a part of them. It is a pity that the sole patristic support for this conjecture lies in a mistranslation of the "recognoscentibus" (attesting) of the "Muratorian Fragment," which Mr. Arnold renders by the word "revise."

[2] Apol., i. 61 (John iii. 6).

quotation, which are common to him and to the fathers generally, and which, as regards this particular passage, are not without a parallel in modern Christian writers. The notion that this passage was borrowed by Justin from another source, which was used also by the author of the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies,[1] is seen to be without foundation when the phraseology of the quotations in this work is compared with corresponding citations in Justin, and in view of the fact that the Homilies are now known to contain a passage from the Fourth Gospel.[2] Apart from particular passages, the theology of Justin, his doctrine of the Logos, or Word, presupposes an acquaintance with some authoritative Scripture in which these terms and conceptions are presented. Tatian, the pupil of Justin, composed a sort of Harmony, the Diatessaron, which, as there is good ground for affirming, was based on the four Gospels of the Canon.[3] The same conclusion as that drawn from the theology of Justin, may fairly be derived from the contents of the seven Ignatian Epistles, the genuineness of which, in the shorter form, is rendered more and more probable with the progress of critical inquiry. There are passages in these Epistles, moreover, which it is scarcely reasonable to doubt were derived from John.[4]

Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, had known at least two of the immediate disciples of Christ, John the Presbyter, a contemporary of the Apostle at Ephesus, and Aristion; and possibly, though not certainly, John the Apostle. He professes to owe his information to two sources; first, to the "elders" themselves; that is, to those who had heard Jesus;

[1] Cf. Hom., xi. 26.

[2] Hom., xix. 22 (John ix. 1 seq.). See, also, Hom. iii. 52 (cf. John ix. 2, 3).

[3] See Prof. Lightfoot's Art., *Contemporary Review*, 1877.

[4] E. g., ad Phil. 7 (cf. John iii. 8), ad Rom., 7 (cf. John vi. 33, 51 seq.).

and, secondly, to their pupils, or followers. Eusebius quotes from him anecdotes in regard to the composition of Matthew and Mark.[1] Hence it has been rashly inferred that Papias was not acquainted with the Gospel of John. But, first, the silence of Eusebius affords no proof whatever that Papias did not refer to this Gospel. Eusebius, for example, notices the use of the 1st Epistle of John by Polycarp, but does not mention his quotations from Paul. Eusebius, in these references, had a particular end in view. Where he found anecdotes of interest respecting the composition of canonical books, he presents them; and instances where the Catholic epistles, which were naturally slower in gaining circulation and acceptance, were referred to, he mentions. Hence, secondly, he does say that Papias used the 1st Epistle of John, and this justifies the assertion that he used the Fourth Gospel. Moreover, Papias in the work from which the extracts in Eusebius are taken, would have no motive for reciting circumstances connected with the writing of the Fourth Gospel, a comparatively recent and familiar event. In short, the silence of Eusebius does not imply, in the slightest degree, a silence on the part of Papias; and if it did, the fact would not prove, or tend to prove, that Papias was not acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, which his use of the 1st Epistle of John shows that he knew and accepted. This argument *e silentio* has been demonstrated by Professor Lightfoot to be absolutely worthless.[2]

It is worthy of mention that Papias, in his enumeration of the Apostles from whom his information directly or indirectly came, gives the first five—Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, and James—in the order in which they are named in the Gospel of John, and connects with them the names of John and Matthew. That is, the Evangelists, the au-

[1] H. E., iii. 39. [2] Contemporary Review, Jan. 1875.

thors of books, are named together, and John is placed before Matthew.[1] The Syriac version, whose composition falls within the second century—probably several decades before its end—includes this Gospel. There is no hint that its authorship was ever doubted by the old Syrian churches, by the churches of Asia Minor, where its reputed author had taught and where he died, nor in any other quarter where Christianity had penetrated. It stands in Eusebius on the list of canonical books which are undisputed.[2]

The final endorsement (John xxi. 24), emanating from those to whom the Gospel was first given, is found in the most ancient manuscripts. It is an independent attestation which cannot be discredited without assuming a double fraud; first, the false appearance, given to the preceding narrative, of being the work of the Apostle, and secondly the pretense that the appended statement is from another source than the work which it closes. Instead of supposing this complexity of deceit, it is more natural to conclude that we have here an authentic certificate, attached to the Gospel from the beginning, by those for whose benefit John wrote or dictated his narrative. This statement falls in remarkably with the statements which we have quoted from the Muratorian Fragment respecting the relation of John's associates to the composition of the Gospel, which they were to recognize, or certify to; and also with the kindred statement of Clement, derived by him from the Presbyters of olden time.

The Paschal controversies of the second century furnish no argument against the genuineness of this Gospel. The defenders of the Quartodeciman practice found nothing in it to clash with their opinion. Polycrates, the venerable

[1] For other proofs of the acquaintance of Papias with the Fourth Gospel, see Prof. Lightfoot's Article, *Contemporary Review*, Oct. 1875.

[2] Eusebius, H. E., iii. 25.

Bishop of Ephesus, who represented the bishops of Asia Minor, in his Letter to Victor of Rome, towards the end of the second century, referred in support of the Asiatic observance, to the example of John "who leaned on the bosom of the Saviour."[1] As to the origin and precise nature of the Quartodeciman observance, there is not yet an entire agreement. Either their Fast, which preceded the Supper on the evening of the 14th Nisan, was a commemoration of the crucifixion of Jesus—in which case there is an exact correspondence with the chronology of John's Gospel, or the Supper was primarily the Jewish Passover, kept at the usual time, and transformed into a Christian festival.[2] In this last case, it has no weight whatever on one side or the other, as to the chronological point in dispute, and consequently affords no help towards determining the question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But whatever may be obscure in the history of this controversy, there is one fact which is beyond contradiction. Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, the successor, and, it may be, the next successor of Papias, in the second century, recognized the Fourth Gospel, and made his appeal to it.[3] Who will believe that after Papias had passed away, or between him and Apollinaris—if there was an interval—this Gospel first saw the light, or acquired canonical authority?

[1] Euseb., *H. E.*, v. 24.

[2] This last hypothesis is maintained by Schürer, in his able and learned discussion of the subject (*Zeitschrift f. die hist. Theol.*, 1870, ii. pp. 182–284). But this conclusion, he justly holds, is not at all adverse to the genuineness of John. "Eine solche Sitte kann ja Johannes sehr wohl beobachtet haben, mag er nun den 13. oder 14. Nisan als den Tag des Abschiedsmahls betrachtet haben" (p. 273). The arguments which may be adduced in support of the other hypothesis, that there were two distinct classes of Quartodecimans, which has been elaborately supported by Weitzel and Steitz, are presented in *Essays on the Sup. Origin of Christ., Suppl. Notes*, p. 584 seq.

[3] Chronicon Pasch., p. 14.

Turning to heretics and heretical sects, we find that Celsus, the earliest writer against Christianity of any note, who probably wrote in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 168–180), resorted to this Gospel, as well as to the other three, to get materials for his attack. This is now conceded. He speaks, for example, of the Word as a title given to Christ by His disciples;[1] of circumstances of the crucifixion which John alone of the Evangelists records;[2] of the pierced hands of Jesus as shown to His followers.[3]

As to Marcion, the language of Tertullian implies that he was acquainted with John's Gospel, but discarded it for the same reason that moved him to acknowledge Paul as the only true Apostle.[4]

Montanism, one of the most remarkable phenomena of the second century, had its rise in Phrygia. Our direct information, however, relative to the canon accepted by the Montanists is scanty; but there is nothing to lead to the opinion that they rejected the Fourth Gospel. But in the great doctrinal controversy of the second century between the Church and the Gnostics, the Gospel of John was allowed as authoritative by both parties. The Basilidians and Valentinians, sects which sprang up in the second quarter of the second century, sought support for their tenets by strained interpretations of this Gospel, which they, in common with their opponents, acknowledged as an Apostolic work. Tertullian expressly states that Valentinus made use of the four Gospels.[5] Unlike Marcion, who would follow no Apostle but Paul, and therefore discarded all of the Gospels except Luke, Valentinus relied upon perverse and arbitrary interpretation as a means of bolstering up his doctrines. One of his followers, Heracleon,

[1] Orig. adv. Celsum, ii. 31. [2] Ibid. ii. 36, 39. [3] Ibid. ii. 55.
[4] Adv. Marcion, iv. 3, 2, 5. De carne Christi, 3.
[5] De Præscript. Hæret. c. 38.

wrote a commentary upon John's Gospel. Hippolytus refers to the interpretation which Valentinus and Basilides gave to particular passages in it.[1] If it be supposed that what was said by adherents of the Gnostic leaders is here imputed to the leaders themselves, in a loose mode of reference—a construction of the language of Hippolytus for which there is no sufficient ground—still there is no reason to doubt that the Fourth Gospel was known and acknowledged by the heresiarchs themselves. If this was not the fact, it must be supposed that the Gospel was fabricated after Valentinus invented his system; an hypothesis which must appear in the highest degree improbable to one who brings an unbiased judgment to the comparison of the two. It must be supposed, likewise, that in the heat and ferment of the Gnostic controversy, this Gospel, the work of an unknown author, was composed, and was accepted by both parties without question, and without suspicion, as the genuine production of the Apostle John. Such a theory is simply incredible. The Fourth Gospel, both by its internal structure, and by the way in which it was acknowledged and treated by the orthodox and by their antagonists, is proved to have had an authoritative standing before the Gnostic heresies to which we have referred, were developed.

Keim, one of the most distinguished of the recent writers of the skeptical school, concedes that this Gospel was quoted by Valentinus; that it was at hand when Basilides wrote, and was, or might have been, used by him; that it was among the Gospels known to Marcion. He concedes, moreover, that Justin Martyr derives quotations from it; that it preceded the Epistles of Barnabas and the Ignatian Epistles; and that this Gospel was used as early in the extant literature as were the other three Gospels.[2] In truth, the most judicious even of the opponents of the Jo-

[1] Ref. omn. Hær. vi. 35, vii. 22, 27. [2] Geschichte Jesu, i. 137.

hannine authorship now concede that the external attestation in the case of the Fourth Gospel is fully as strong as in the case of the other three. The phenomena are what we should expect, if, as Irenæus affirms, the Apostle John wrote this Gospel at Ephesus, near the end of the first century; and they are explicable on no other hypothesis.

The First Epistle of John furnishes a powerful argument for the genuineness of the Gospel. Both are by the same author. The genuineness of the Epistle was never in ancient times called in question. Notwithstanding that it does not bear the name of John, it has never been ascribed to any other writer, and must have been attributed to the Evangelist by its first readers. There are no signs in it of an attempt to make out a claim to apostolic authorship, such as characterize spurious productions. Yet the whole tone and contents of the Epistle are such as befit an Apostle. Who can believe that the writer himself was one "who walketh in darkness," and was a liar like those whom he denounced?[1] It is extremely probable, as we have said, that a passage in Polycarp's Letter was drawn from this Epistle. Eusebius tells us that Papias made use of it. Thus the Johannine authorship is strongly attested. But this carries with it the Johannine authorship of the Gospel.

The decisive force of the external evidence for the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel can be neutralized in its effect only by internal proofs in the opposite direction which are of equal weight. But difficulties which are of the writer's own creation, and feelings which are purely subjective, must not be suffered to outweigh positive testimony. How much room there is for fallacious criticism of this nature, is illustrated by the history of the Platonic

[1] 1 John i. 6, ii. 22.

dialogues. Panætius, a noted Stoic philosopher at Athens, went so far as to reject the Phædon as not being the work of Plato. He admired Plato, but disbelieving in the immortality of the soul, he thought that the main proposition and the arguments of this Dialogue, are unworthy of the philosopher to whom it is ascribed. Then, as Grote observes, he was probably influenced by a singularity in the Phædon—it being the only dialogue in which the author mentions himself in the third person,[1]—a point, it may be remarked, in which the Phædon resembles the Fourth Gospel. Certain modern critics have rejected "the Laws," on internal grounds. This is done by Zeller, who is also one of the opponents of the genuineness of the Gospel. On this topic, Grote says: "There are few dialogues in the list against which stronger objections on internal grounds can be brought than Leges and Menexenus. Yet both of them stand authenticated, beyond all reasonable dispute, as genuine works of Plato, not merely by the canon of Thrasyllus, but, also, by the testimony of Aristotle."[2] Grote adds: "Considering that Plato's period of philosophic composition extended over fifty years, and that the circumstances of his life are most imperfectly known to us, it is surely hazardous to limit the range of his varieties, on the faith of a critical repugnance not merely subjective and fallible, but withal of entirely modern growth."[3]

In the case, however, of the Fourth Gospel, the internal evidence on the affirmative side is even more impressive than the external, and the two sorts of proof corroborate one another.

One of the main points to be considered is the structure and contents of the Fourth Gospel when compared with the other three—the Synoptists. The Fourth Gospel presents an independent, but not a contradictory representation of

[1] Grote's *Plato*, i. 158. [2] Ibid. p., 209. [3] Ibid., p. 201.

the life and teaching of Christ. His "country," according to this Gospel, is still Galilee; for this is the proper interpretation of the passage (John iv. 44) referring to the honor bestowed on a prophet out of his own country. There is nothing in this Gospel inconsistent with supposing a Galilean ministry of Jesus, such as the Synoptists describe. Such a ministry is implied in John's narrative.[1] On the other hand, the Synoptists, although they present us mainly with the details of the ministry in Galilee, incidentally, but decisively, corroborate the Fourth Gospel in ascribing to Jesus, also, a ministry of considerable duration in Judea.

Matthew follows the account of the Baptism and Temptation of Jesus, with the statement: "Now when Jesus heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee" (iv. 12). Mark (i. 14) has a like statement. Luke (iv. 14) narrates, also, the departure into Galilee, after the record of the Temptation. John records a prior visit to Galilee, and a journey thence to Jerusalem to the Passover, after a sojourn in Capernaum of "not many days" (John ii. 12); all before John was cast into prison (John iii. 24). The return of Jesus to Galilee which is mentioned in John iv. 3, may be identical with the first visit to Galilee reported by the Synoptists, as above stated. Two other Passovers are referred to by John (vi. 4, xi. 55). The ministry of Jesus must have continued, therefore, for at least two and a half years. Whether the "Feast" referred to in John v. 1 was a Passover, or not, is uncertain. If it was a Passover, or if there was another Passover which John does not expressly mention, then the duration of His ministry was

[1] Thus, there was an interval of several months, at least, between the return of Jesus to Galilee (John iv. 3), and His departure to Jerusalem (v. 1); and there is an interval prior to the Feast of Tabernacles (vii. 2), during which "he walked in Galilee" (vii. 1). According to John (vii. 41), it was asked at Jerusalem, by way of objection: "Shall Christ come out of Galilee?" Cf. John vii. 52.

three and a half years. The Synoptists refer to no Passover in explicit terms, after the commencement of the Saviour's public ministry. But they definitely imply that at least one such Passover occurred (Luke vi. 1): the ripened harvest determines the time. They imply a repeated and prolonged ministry in Judea (Matt. xxviii. 57 seq.; Luke xxiii. 50 seq.; Mark xv. 42 seq.; Luke x. 38; Luke xxiii. 34, Matt. xxiii. 37).

Luke begins the narrative of what purports to be the final departure of Christ from Galilee, preceding the crucifixion, at c. ix., ver. 51. The interval between this passage and xviii. 14, is filled up with matter not contained in the other Synoptists,—matter "as a whole wanting in exact chronological arrangement," [1] and relating to other portions of the Saviour's ministry, as well as to that included in the final journey from Galilee to Jerusalem. The existence of this body of matter which does not find a fit place in the scheme which tacitly assumes but one journey from Galilee to a Passover, tends to corroborate the longer chronology of John.

When we examine other leading features in the history, which both the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel refer to, we find no reason to distrust the statements of the latter. For example, the narrative, in John, of the temporary connection of Jesus with several of His disciples, immediately after His baptism, explains, what would otherwise be difficult to understand, their instant compliance with His call to drop their occupations, and form a permanent connection with Him. The exasperation of the Pharisees, and their determination to inflict death upon Jesus without delay, are accounted for, in this Gospel, by the extraordinary effect on the popular mind, of the miracle at the grave of Lazarus. But there is a rectification of the Synoptists in minor par-

[1] Robinson, *Harmony*, p. 199.

ticulars, an entire independence, and fearlessness of contradiction, which show that the writer was haunted by no fear that his authority would be questioned. Nothing can be more unlike the temper in which a falsifier would go to his work. There is no attempt to dovetail his narrative into the older and universally acknowledged histories.[1] This characteristic of the Fourth Gospel renders it impossible to account for its composition by any other than the Apostle, and baffles every attempt to explain how it could have been received by the churches, if it had not been known to emanate from him.

The miracles recorded by John do not differ in their general character from those which are described by the Synoptists. The turning of water into wine involves no greater control of spirit over matter, no more stupendous exertion of supernatural power, than the feeding of the five thousand which is narrated in the other Gospels.

The Tübingen critics accuse the author of the Fourth Gospel of attributing to the disciples and others an incredible misunderstanding of the words of Christ. Nicodemus thinks that He is speaking of a literal birth (John iii. 4). The Jews were at a loss to see how He could give them His flesh to eat (vi. 52). When He spoke of the "sleep" of Lazarus, He was taken literally, though the reference was to his death (xi. 11). But the same tropical style, and the same want of comprehension in His hearers, is fully exemplified in the reports of the Synoptists. When He spoke of "the leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees" (Matt. xvi. 6), they thought it was because they had "taken no bread." His direction to sell their garment and buy

[1] As an instance, see John xii. 2–9, compared with Matt. xxvi. 6–14. The variations of the narrative in John would be quite needless, on the supposition that they were the product of invention.

a sword was construed as a literal command to provide themselves with weapons (Luke xxii. 36).

Looking at the style of the discourses recorded in this Gospel, we find them to be in a different vein from the more easily remembered gnomes and parables which make up the Galilean tradition. But, first, it cannot reasonably be thought that Jesus uniformly, especially in private converse with His disciples, or when speaking at Jerusalem, uttered Himself in apothegms and parables. There are striking instances, in the Synoptists, of utterances in the precise manner of the Johannine reports. The most marked example of this kind is in Matt. xi. 27 (Luke x. 22). Secondly, the resemblance in the style of the discourses to the style of the other portions of the book implies only that these teachings of Christ had been assimilated, and reproduced, it might be in a condensed form, in the language of the Evangelist; and this is no more than might be expected from his peculiar character as disclosed in this book, and from the length of time that had elapsed since he had heard them. This freedom in expression is reconcilable with substantial fidelity in the reports given by the Evangelist of the Lord's teaching. The accuracy of the Apostle's recollection is, now and then, strikingly, because incidentally, revealed; as in the expression, "Arise, let us go hence" (xiv. 31), which meets us in the midst of the discourse of Jesus to His disciples prior to His arrest. If we suppose that at this point they left the table, and that the Evangelist remembered this fact, the expression becomes intelligible. Otherwise it has no meaning.[1]

The two or three places in which the Evangelist passes,

[1] In John ii. 19 are the words of Jesus: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up." This must have been said by Him: it accounts for the accusation in Matt. xxvi. 61.

without advertisement to the reader, from a report of the language of others, out into the stream of his own reflections, are an indication of fidelity; since one who was inventing a narrative would not be so absorbed in the subject-matter as to neglect to mark the transition.

In most cases the earliest and strongest impressions of the evangelical history are gained from the first three Gospels. The brief, pointed sayings of Jesus, which at the outset were most easily remembered, and for this reason formed the principal part of the stock of the Galilean tradition, make the same sort of impression now. The *naïve* style, often pathetic in its simplicity, of the Synoptists, meets all minds alike. It is for this reason that many approach John's Gospel with the conception of Christ's teaching and life which has been stamped upon them as a consequence of their familiarity with the first three. But when these are critically studied, the estimate of their character is modified. The impossibility of making out a chronological order for many of the events and sayings which they record, the great brevity of their reports of conversations and interviews, which in many cases must have been extended, the frequent discrepancies, in the form at least, which the several narratives exhibit, when compared with each other, show that, as histories, they are quite incomplete. It should occasion no surprise, then, if we find another Gospel, written from a different point of view, a more consecutive narrative, which fills up gaps in the Synoptical tradition, and provides supplementary matter which that tradition would not so easily or naturally take up. We should not say an exaggerated estimate of the Synoptical Gospels, for that would be impossible, but an estimate in some respects incorrect of their real structure, an estimate which fails to observe their limitations, is often at the root of the suspicion with which the Fourth Gospel is regarded.

The catholic spirit of the Fourth Gospel, is made an objection to the Johannine authorship. But difficulties of this nature, raised by Keim, and other writers of the same school, are largely of their own making. First, they frame to themselves a conception of the Apostolic age, in which John appears in the character of a Judaizer, instead of having given to Paul, as the Apostle to the Gentiles himself declares, the right hand of fellowship. Then they infer that he could not have attained to the catholic and spiritual tone which belongs to this Gospel. Starting from false premises, they land in an equally false conclusion. Secondly, they underrate the inevitable effect upon the Apostle's mind of the events which had gradually placed an impassable barrier between Judaism and Christianity, and the influence of a residence of not far from a score of years in the midst of a Gentile community. The lessons of Providence blended with the teaching of the Spirit. Thirdly, the imputation that the Fourth Gospel attributes to Christ a condemnation of the Mosaic Law, or an antagonism to the Old Testament system, has no better support than perverse and mistaken exegesis. The spiritual character of the religion of the Gospel is set forth in Matthew, as well as in John; and in connection with the most emphatic statement of this truth in the Fourth Gospel, occurs the assertion that "Salvation is of the Jews" (John iv. 22). It is objected that the assurance of Jesus to the woman of Samaria that worship is to be spiritual, and not confined to the temple, could not have been uttered at that early day. But how far does this saying go beyond the declaration of Jesus, which is reported by Matthew (xii. 6), that "one greater than the temple is here"? It must be remembered that words of Jesus which made little impression on the Disciples at the moment, were recalled at a later day, and their true force discerned.

It is not true that the theology of the prologue, or of

the rest of the Gospel, is that of Philo. In Philo the Logos stands in connection with a complex system of intermediate Powers, and oscillates between a person and an abstraction. The system of Philo is dualistic. An incarnation of the Logos—the doctrine that the Word became Flesh—clashes with the essential principles of his scheme, according to which matter is the source of evil, and the divine can have no contact with the earthly. Now we know that Cerinthus, who was of the Alexandrian school, trained in Egypt, brought forward the Judæo-Gnostic doctrine—a natural product of that school—that Christ did not really become incarnate, that Christ and Jesus were two, brought together at the baptism, and parting at the crucifixion. This doctrine, in its fundamental notion, the First Epistle of John repudiates. It is Cerinthus, according to the early ecclesiastical tradition, whose opinions John tacitly opposes in the Gospel. External and internal evidence combine in favor of this opinion. Instead of the Evangelist being an Alexandrian, therefore, it is Alexandrian speculations which he combats.

The central doctrine of John that the Word was made Flesh, ought to be sufficient to confute the charge of Dualism brought against this Gospel. The conception of matter as inherently evil is foreign to the mind of its author. The antithesis of light and darkness is moral, not physical or necessary, in every passage where it appears. Men are in darkness because they *love* darkness rather than light (John iii. 19). The Jews who were hostile to Jesus are called children of the Devil, obviously in an ethical sense as every one must see who compares the passages in the Gospel with corresponding statements in the First Epistle (1 John iii. 8, 12).[1] That anything else is meant, that there is any reference to a "father of Satan," a Gnostic

[1] See Meyer, *in loco.*

Demiurge, is one of the strange freaks of interpretation which it is hardly requisite to notice.

That John had a certain impression of the person and office of Christ, and that he enunciates this faith at the outset, in glowing words, does not imply, in the slightest degree, an intention to depart from historical verity in the narrative which follows. Matthew, too, has a thesis, that Jesus is the Christ. Mark begins by declaring that He is the Christ, the Son of God. Neither of them is a neutral, uninterested chronicler. Both are believers, and for this reason they are moved to write. The question in the case of the Fourth Evangelist, as respecting the other two, is whether his impression relative to Jesus was of subjective origin, or the effect of that historical manifestation, objective and real, which he had beheld. Did the idea beget the history, or the history the idea?

There is a fundamental unity in the conception of the person of Christ in the various books of the New Testament. This does not always appear on the surface, but it underlies the various representations of His person and work. In the Synoptists, the exalted nature of Christ is the silent postulate of the descriptions which are given of His relation to the World as its Judge, and of the glory that invests Him in this character. In the Epistles of Paul, His pre-existence and His relation to the world are set forth in terms which are the equivalent of those in which John embodies the same truth.[1]

It has been confidently asserted that the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel cannot be by the same Author. But if it be true that John had lived fifteen or twenty years in a Greek-speaking community, after writing the Revelation, and considering the different mood and the diversity of circumstances under which the books were produced, is

[1] See 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Phil. ii. 6.

there ground for that assertion? As to the theology of the two works, there is not that disparity which has frequently been affirmed to exist. On the contrary, there are striking affinities of thought, and phraseology. Jesus is expressly called in the Revelation, "the Word of God"—ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev. xix. 13). He is very often designated as the Lamb, as in John i. 29; the only difference being that in the Apocalypse the diminutive (ἀρνίον) is used. Baur, the leader of the attack upon the genuineness of the Gospel in recent times, has remarked upon the points of resemblance which render the Gospel a kind of spiritualized Apocalypse.[1] Which is the more probable, that this relation is due to a development of the Apostle's thought and feeling, or to the elaborate artifice of an imitator? Why should an imitator neglect the obvious, salient features of his model, and aim to incorporate more occult qualities of thought and language, which it requires a critical attention to identify? But if it were made clear that the Apostle could not have written both works; then, notwithstanding the attestation of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the Apocalypse would have to be ascribed to another,—perhaps, John the Presbyter, the contemporary of the Apostle at Ephesus. This book is not included in the Peschito—the old Syriac version,—and it is apparently not accepted by the author of the Muratorian canon. The evidence for the Johannine authorship of the Gospel, both external and internal, is much stronger than for the traditional view as to the authorship of the Apocalypse.

It is worthy of note that the Apocalypse makes mention of a germinant Gnosticism in the churches of Asia Minor; a phenomenon similar to that which is noticed by Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians, written a few years earlier. The First Epistle of John brings to light the existence of the

[1] Gesch. d. drei erst. Jahrhunderten, p. 147.

same error in a riper form; and this error, too, the Gospel, not in a polemical way, but incidentally, condemns.

One objection to the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is based on the alleged disparity between the spirit of John, who in conjunction with his brother received the name of Boanerges—a spirit which is supposed to be manifest in the Apocalypse—and the tone of the Gospel. But we know little of John apart from what we learn through his writings. Vehemence, especially in the defence of friends, is often coupled with an affectionate and contemplative turn of mind. The First Epistle, which in various ways, affords proof of the genuineness of the Gospel, both being evidently from the same pen, exhibits an energy and occasional severity quite in keeping with the title given to John, and consonant with passages in the Apocalypse.[1] The First Epistle, at the same time, gives the same emphasis to Love that forms a distinguishing feature of the Gospel.

The indirect manner in which the Author of the Fourth Gospel discloses himself carries in it marks of sincerity and truth which it is hard to resist. The circumstance that, unlike the other New Testament writers, he does not speak of John "the Baptist," but omits this appellation, is most easily explained on the supposition that the Author naturally would not distinguish himself from another of the same name, who was, also, his former teacher. But the mode in which John the Apostle is introduced, without the mention of his name, indicates that the Author is speaking of himself. There is a kind of modesty, a sensitive feeling, which it is most unnatural to regard as the trick of a forger. "One of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother." Why is not the other of the two named? What other reason than be-

[1] See 1 John, i. 6 10, ii. 11, 22, iii. 8, iv. 20, v. 10.

cause it was he who was writing the narrative, John himself? Is this the mode which a *falsarius* who wished to palm off his book as the work of John, would adopt to secure his end? It would not only be contrary to all precedent in apocryphal literature; it would be contrary to nature.

"Through the whole Fourth Gospel," says Hase, "while the Apostle John is never named, there moves an unnamed, as it were, veiled form, which sometimes comes forward, yet without the veil being entirely lifted. It is inconceivable that the Author should not have known, or did not care to know, who this Disciple was, whom Jesus loved, who, at the last Supper, leaned upon His breast, who with Peter followed after Jesus when He was taken by the soldiers, who received his mother as a legacy from Him, who again with Peter first hurries to the grave of the Risen One. There must, therefore, be some sort of special relation of the Author to this person; there must have been a reason for not naming him. How natural to suppose that he designates himself with that name which expresses the highest contents and the whole joy of his life—as 'that Disciple whom Jesus loved!' The objection of Weisse that this would have been an arrogant assumption shows that he has not entered into that joyous pride, mingled with all humility, which grows out of the consciousness of having been loved, without desert on his part, by Him who is the object of his own supreme love. In the Synoptical Gospels, also, John appears, in connection with Peter, as an intimate and trusted Disciple; he is reckoned by Paul among the 'pillar' Apostles, the heads of the Church at Jerusalem; in the Ephesian tradition, he is the "disciple who leaned on the breast of the Lord."[1]

While the writer thus signifies who he is, he also dis-

[1] Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, (1875), p. 48.

tinctly, yet not obtrusively, represents himself as an eye-witness of the circumstances which he relates. With regard to one occurrence only, which was astonishing to himself, and which he felt might be equally so to others, does he formally aver this to be the fact (John xix. 35).

Let us see how this profession of authorship, so clearly yet so modestly intimated, is sustained by certain personal characteristics which pertain to the book.

First, this Gospel is the work of one writer. The 24th verse of the last chapter is probably an independent testimony appended to the book by those to whose hands it was first committed. The passage on the woman taken in adultery (viii. 1–12) is not a part of the original text, but was early introduced into the work from some other source. It may be authentic history, but it was not in the Gospel as it came from the hands of its author. These passages excepted, this Gospel, from beginning to end, emanates from one mind and one pen. All hypotheses which would assume a composite authorship are shut out by the most conclusive internal evidence. Either the Apostle, or some other person—at all events, a single individual—wrote the book.

Secondly, it was written, so to speak, at one heat. There is no combination of documents, no compilation of materials collected from different quarters, and connected, or fused, in one composition. There is such a vital unity, such a continuity and flow, as prove incontestably, that, whatever previous reflection there may have been, there was one act of production. There is no trace of slow, elaborate contrivance of the kind that belongs to an artificial work.[1] The progress of the narrative and the relation of

[1] Professor Holtzmann has undertaken to show (*Zeitschrift f. wissenschaftl. Theol.*, 1869, 1, 2, 4), that phrases are culled here and there from Luke and other writers, and that the work is made up in this artificial way.

its parts to one another show it to be one living whole. As Hase has said, it is seamless, like the garment of Christ.

Thirdly, the Author was a Jew by birth, but not an Alexandrian. It has often been denied that he was a Jew. He speaks of "the Jews," it is said, in such a manner as to indicate that he was not one of them. But considering the time when the Gospel was written, and those for whom it was immediately designed, this is not unnatural. The Jewish nationality and the temple alike lay in ruins. The destruction of Jerusalem, in conjunction with the events that preceded and followed it, effectually separated the body of Christians from the stock of Israel, and developed the antagonism of the Jews to the new faith and to all of its adherents. Paul, in his 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians, which was written as early as A. D. 53, speaks of the severe persecutions which the churches of Judea had suffered from their Jewish countrymen. The murder of James, the brother of the Lord, preceded the siege of Vespasian, when the Christians withdrew to Pella, separating their fortunes from those of their Jewish countrymen. In the period that elapsed before the composition of the Gospel, this bitter antagonism on the part of the Jews had not been softened. Christianity had acquired its full independence. Under these circumstances, and addressing a community predominantly made up of Gentiles, the Apostle John might naturally designate his former countrymen as "the Jews."[1] But the evidence of the Jewish extraction of the writer of this Gospel is convincing. He is acquainted with the

No book can be more unlike a piece of mosaic whose parts are cemented together in this fashion. Every such theory, independently of the precarious instances adduced in support of it, is psychologically incompatible with the patent characteristics of the book.

[1] This phraseology is not confined to John; it is found in other Judaic Apostles: see Matt. xxviii. 15; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 24; 1 Thess. ii. 14.

Hebrew Scriptures in the original text. This indicates that he was not an Alexandrian. He shows a familiarity with the geography and customs of the Holy Land, which proves that he had resided there. If he speaks of a Bethany beyond the Jordan—the true reading for "Bethabara"—he does not mistake the Bethany spoken of by the other Evangelists, the location of which he elsewhere correctly states; and it is much more reasonable to suppose that an old town has passed away, or an old name of a place has been changed, than that a writer, who shows himself so accurately informed, has erred wilfully or through mistake. Of the topography at the opening of ch. iv., Renan says, that none but a Jew of Palestine who had often passed into the valley of Sichem, could have written it.[1] He knows that one must descend, to go from Cana to Capernaum (iv. 47).[2] If he speaks of a high-priest "for that year," it was not because he thought the office an annual one, but on account of the supreme importance which "that year" of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus had in his mind. There is no need to dwell on such points, since the most intelligent opponents of the Johannine authorship at present attach no weight to these alleged archæological difficulties on which Baur and others formerly laid so much stress.[3] The language and style of the Fourth Gospel are pervaded with evidences that the Author was a Hebrew by birth and by culture. This is the verdict of Ewald and of other scholars who are most competent to pronounce a judgment on that question. The Hebrew extraction and education of the writer of this Gospel are conceded by Keim.

Fourthly, we call attention once more to the latent con-

[1] Vie de Jésus (13th ed.), p. 493.

[2] Cf. Godet, *Comment sur l' Évang. de S. Jean*, (2d ed.), p. 126.

[3] Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, p. 133; Mangold, *Theol. Literaturzeit.*, 1866, p. 361.

sciousness of authority that belongs to the Author of this Gospel—authority, we mean, as a historian. He is one who enjoys a credit that delivers him from all consciousness of exposure to contradiction. How else shall we account for the scheme of his work? The Saviour's ministry is exhibited as continuing for upwards of three years. The other Gospels, the recognized authorities with which he was not unacquainted, apparently limited its duration to a year and a half. Here, then, is a bold deviation from what had come to be the prevailing conception of the length of the Saviour's ministry. Moreover, Judea as well as Galilee is made the theatre of that ministry. There is no conceivable purpose which a forger might not have accomplished without laying himself open to the charge of contradicting, in this particular, the accredited Evangelists. Why present this gratuitous provocation to doubt and denial? Is this natural to one who is doubtful of his own credit, of one who is simulating the character of an Apostle? The same sort of independence which belongs to the general plan, extends to the details, of the work. To take a single instance. Matthew describes the scourging of the money-changers from the temple. He makes it occur in connection with the Passover when Christ was betrayed and crucified. The Fourth Evangelist records the same or a like event, but places it at the beginning of the Saviour's ministry. It is possible that the same act was done twice; first, at that time, and once more just before the Saviour's death. Or, it may be that, as the Galilean tradition included a description of but one Passover, and that the last, this event, which took place at an earlier festival of the same kind, is introduced by Matthew out of its chronological place. But, whatever explanation is adopted, the writer of the Fourth Gospel, by placing this transaction at the beginning of the Saviour's public work, and by not intimating that another

transaction like it took place at the end, exposed himself to the imputation of differing from the other Evangelists. What motive could a falsifier have for thus exciting suspicion against himself needlessly? Why not fall in with the current representation and belief, instead of venturing to misdate this marked occurrence? No satisfactory solution of this difficulty is possible. The candid student must feel that the writer had a conscious and acknowledged authority among Christians, which lifted him above the fear that his statements would be disbelieved, however diverse they might seem to be from those of the other Evangelists. In one place, after describing certain events which the other Evangelists do not relate, he does throw in the explanation that "John was not yet cast into prison" (John iii. 24). This shows that he was not unaware of that frame-work of the Saviour's ministry which belongs to the Synoptical narratives. He makes here a chronological remark for the information of his readers. Notwithstanding this acquaintance on his part with the accepted tradition, he proceeds with the utmost independence, taking no pains to harmonize his narrations with those of the Synoptists. Such a course on the side of a falsifier, who would naturally wish to disarm suspicion, is utterly inexplicable.

5. The Author of the Fourth Gospel manifests a "historical consciousness." That is to say, his attitude of mind in reference to Jesus, and to the facts of His life which he undertakes to record, is the opposite of that of a romancer.

It is true that he has a definite idea of the person and office of Christ, and this he expresses at the outset, applying to Him a term which had become widely current, partly through the influence of the Alexandrian Judaism. He is the Logos—the Revealer and Mediator. It is true that this Gospel is not without a plan and an orderly progress. The growing faith of the disciples appears in contrast with

the unbelief and increasing hostility of the Jews. The theme is set forth in the plaintive words: "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." Moreover, there was an end for which the book was written, namely, that those to whom it was given might believe in Jesus and have the blessing of a spiritual life (xix. 35, xx. 31). But a history, in order to be authentic, has no need to be either aimless or planless. Its credibility is not impaired by the circumstance that its author follows a coherent plan, and has a particular motive, not unworthy, for preparing it. The only question is whether the actual course of events was in accordance with the record.

That the author had a genuine historical feeling, that he is not clothing theological ideas in a garb of fiction, is obvious, first, from the numerous statements which have no other than a historical value, and which are brought in simply for the reason that the facts contained in them were remembered. Some of them disclose unmistakably the autoptic character of the narration. The particular mention of the time of the occurrence of events, as in John x. 21—"and it was winter,"—the designation of localities, as when it is said that John was baptizing at "Ænon near to Salim," that Jesus went to the Mount of Olives, and returned to Jerusalem in the morning (viii. 1), that certain words were uttered by Him in "the treasury" (viii. 20); that a pool at Jerusalem was near the sheep-gate (v. 2); that the judgment-seat of Pilate is called the Pavement, but in the Hebrew "Gabbatha" (xix. 13); that Philip was of Bethsaida in Galilee (xii. 21); and parenthetical references like that to the anointing of Christ by Mary (xi. 2), before the incident had been narrated, are instances of unconscious historical fidelity. The fulness with which the testimony of John the Baptist is given—who, as we have before observed, is called John, without the addition of the

appellation, the Evangelist John being himself the narrator —is natural for one who had been his disciple. It was probably due, also, to the fact that adherents of John still existed as a sect, whom the Evangelist sought, by an appeal to facts within his recollection, to convince that he whom they followed was not the true Light, but only the forerunner and witness. It is often said that the recognition of Jesus as "the Lamb of God," by the Baptist, would imply a stage of knowledge higher than he had attained to,—would be, in short, an anachronism. But there is nothing impossible in a prophetic glimpse of this sort,—a momentary elevation, it might be, above his ordinary idea of the Messiah. Nor would a view of this kind, suggested by the recollection of a passage in Isaiah (liii. 7), be psychologically inconsistent with the fact of his wavering for a moment, at a later day, in his confidence in the Messianic character of Jesus, when no tidings reached him in his prison of a demonstration on the part of Christ, such as, on the ordinary plane of his thoughts, he was in the habit of expecting.

The Fourth Gospel brings to light personal character, sometimes by a few, unobtrusive touches, and in a way to inspire confidence in the fidelity of the narrative. The account of the Woman of Samaria is an example. Nicodemus is thrice referred to. First, he comes to Jesus by night, a sincere but unsatisfied and timid inquirer (John iii. 1). At a later day (John vii. 50, 51), he has acquired sufficient courage to remonstrate against the injustice of condemning Jesus unheard. Finally (John xix. 3), he comes boldly with his myrrh and aloes to do the last offices of affection to the body of Jesus.

But the main thing in the historical consciousness of this Evangelist, is yet to be mentioned. The soul of the Writer is animated by a faith and love, of which Jesus is

the source and object. This is manifest almost in every line both of the Gospel and Epistle. He professes to believe on account of what he had seen. "We have beheld his glory" (John i. 14); "That which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes" (1 John i. 1). The genesis and growth of his faith, and of that of his companions, were indissolubly connected with the teachings and miracles which he records. How often, after one of these records—for example, after the account of the miracle at Cana (ii. 11)—it is added that His disciples *believed.* The Evangelist shows what it was, and why it was, that he and his companions believed, although Jesus was rejected by so many. The roots of that inward experience which was his life and joy, were in these transactions that he is induced to relate in order that others may share with him the spiritual blessing. There is thus an autobiographic element which runs through the narrative.[1] It opens with an explanation of the way in which the writer was directed to Jesus by John the Baptist. It is the origin and secret of his own faith which he will describe. Is this profession of faith in Jesus hypocritical? Or was the source of that faith anything different from what the Evangelist asserts it to have been? Take away the verity of the history, and you have no account to give of that religious life which sprang out of it.

The author of the Fourth Gospel had a personal love to Jesus. He was not only the disciple whom Jesus loved; he was the disciple who loved Jesus. If there is any such thing as sincerity in the world, this fact is manifest. He loved the Master, as Grotius has said, not simply as the Messiah, but with a warm personal affection, as one friend loves another. How did he acquire this love? Does not this history give a true answer to the question? Is it

[1] See Godet, *Comment. sur. l'Évang. de S. Jean* (2d ed.), Intr. p. 110.

credible that one who felt this love to Jesus, which must have been awakened by a knowledge of His life, that was acquired somewhere—is it credible that one thus bound to Jesus by the strongest ties of love and reverence, would have deliberately set to work to falsify the whole history of His life among men? Is it credible that he would have deserted and cast aside the evangelical documents, from which, if from anywhere, his love to Jesus had been kindled, and have manufactured fictions in the room of them? Verily the skeptical hypothesis makes a heavy draught on our credulity.

If the Gospel of John be spurious, it has no parallel, as we have said before, in the apocryphal literature. If we examine the apocryphal Gospels which are extant, we shall see that they relate to the beginning, or to the close, of the Saviour's life. The infancy and childhood of Jesus, the character and doings of His mother, are chosen as the field for the fantastic and silly tales of books like the Protevangelium of James, and the Gospel of Thomas. The *Acta Pilati*, in the various forms in which it is found, is an enlargement of the canonical narratives of the Saviour's intercourse with the Roman Procurator; while the second part of the Gospel of Nicodemus, in its different forms, treats of the Descent of Christ into Hades. But there is no example of an attempt to traverse the whole ground of the evangelical history, to recast that sacred history according to a new chronological scheme, and, instead of amplifying or decorating the records of miracles in the canonical Evangelists, to substitute for them narratives entirely new. For example, an apocryphal writer, if he ventured at all upon the field occupied by the Evangelists, instead of introducing the narrative of the raising of Lazarus, would have connected his own fancies, or doctrinal notions, with a miracle already recorded and believed, as the resurrection of the

son of the widow of Nain. Or he would have exercised his invention in a province only partially touched by the canonical histories—a *terra incognita*—like the youth of Jesus. The Protevangelium ends thus: "And I James that wrote this history in Jerusalem, a commotion having arisen when Herod died, withdrew myself to the wilderness until the commotion in Jerusalem ceased, glorifying the Lord God, who had given me the gift and the wisdom to write this history" (c. 25). So the Gospel of Thomas concludes: "After all these things I, Thomas, the Israelite, have written what I have seen, and have recounted them to the Gentiles, and to our brethren," etc. (c. 15). This is the characteristic manner of the apocryphal writers. On the contrary, in the Fourth Gospel, the author modestly withholds his name, which is assumed to be known to his readers, and is revealed only in an incidental way, as he narrates events in which he directly participated. If the book is spurious, there is involved a refinement in fraud without another example in this kind of literature. And then the success of the amazing fraud is equally without a parallel. The apocryphal Gospels never gained any general currency, or acknowledgment; for the Gospel of the Hebrews, which substantially corresponded to the canonical Matthew, is hardly to be reckoned among them. Can we believe that the Fourth Gospel which, if it be spurious, outstripped them all in audacity of invention, found no difficulty in securing a reception at the hands of the disciples of the Apostle John, of the churches of Asia, where he had taught, and which at the end of the first century we know to have been large and numerous, and of all the churches of the Roman world, so that not a lisp of contradiction or doubt respecting its genuineness is uttered by any ecclesiastical writer of the second or third centuries. There was a question about the Epistle to the Hebrews, whether it

was written by Paul, and whether, if written by one of his pupils, it ought to be adopted into the canon. There was a question about the Second Epistle of Peter, whether it was really composed by that Apostle.[1] There were some of the churches apparently, which doubted the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse.[2] But this Gospel, so unique in its character, so likely to challenge dispute, if its authenticity were not assured beyond a peradventure, silently took its place by the side of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, with none to question its pretensions.

If the Fourth Gospel was not written by John, it is a product of pious fraud. Among the Jews, in the later period of their history, prior to the birth of Christ, many pseudonymous works were composed. This was true mostly of the Alexandrians, but not of them exclusively. Authors, sensible that the age of inspiration had passed, and writing from no motive of literary ambition, embodied under the name of Solomon, or some other ancient worthy, the lessons which they thought adapted to the times. At first and often, this was a literary device, no deceit being intended. It early led, however, to intentional fraud. The same practice passed into those Christian circles where Judaism and Judaizing influences were potent. A distinction was made between esoteric and exoteric doctrine, between what the enlightened might hold, and what it was expedient to impart to the people,—a distinction which had its prime source in the Alexandrian philosophy. Under the cover of this false ethical principle, writings were fabricated like the Sibylline oracles, and the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies. But pious frauds of this nature were possible only where there was a defective sense of the obligation of truth. They are utterly repugnant to a sound Christian feeling; nor is there ground for supposing that

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 3. [2] Ibid., vii. 25.

in the ancient church, generally speaking, they were regarded otherwise than as at present. Speaking of one of these fabricated books, the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*, Tertullian says, that "in Asia the Presbyter who composed that writing, as if he were augmenting Paul's name from his own store, after being convicted, and confessing that he had done it from love of Paul, was removed from office."[1] This act is indicative of the judgment that would be formed of such an imposture by Christians generally at that time.

Whoever reads the Fourth Gospel can judge for himself whether the author stood on the low plane of the manufacturers of apocryphal writings, or had a conscience sufficiently educated to perceive the really iniquitous character of this species of fraud. There is no doubt as to the impression which the Gospel has made, in this particular, on all the generations of Christian men who have lived since it was written.

This Gospel, in respect to the power and elevation that characterize it, has nothing to approach it in the productions of the post-apostolic age. Compare it with the Epistle of Polycarp, which is not wanting in earnestness, and not unworthy of a Christian pastor, and the heaven-wide superiority of the Author of the Gospel, to the Apostolic Fathers, becomes evident. There are some, to be sure, in our day, who complain of the "monotony" of this Gospel, and are little impressed by it. Far different has been the verdict of multitudes of every grade of intelligence and culture; including gifted men as diverse from one another as Clement of Alexandria, Martin Luther, and the historian Niebuhr.

The question arises, then, why should a man of this acknowledged power—supposing the author not to be John—

[1] De Baptismo, c. xvii.

choose to skulk behind a mask? Why should he shrink from the open advocacy of his theological tenets, in the face of his contemporaries, none of whom would be a match for him? Who was the great Unknown, who eclipses all the writers about him, but continues to keep his very existence unsuspected?

And if we can imagine that such a man would resort to a trick of this kind, how did he escape detection? How did he escape even a suspicion unfavorable to his false and fraudulent claim?

From whatever side we contemplate the problem, it becomes more and more manifest, as Neander has said, that this Gospel, if it be not the work of the Apostle John, is an insoluble enigma.[1]

[1] Plant. and Train. of the Ch., p. 371.

CHAPTER XI.

WATER-MARKS OF AGE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT HISTORIES.

The Geologist points to ancient sea-beaches, now elevated above the reach of the tide, and to terraces on the margin of rivers, which mark the level to which the waters have risen at different epochs in the past. They are monuments which nature has left of the successive periods in her own history. In like manner do literary productions exhibit indelible traces of the time and circumstances under which they were produced. Emphatically is this true of works which deal with things in the concrete, whether it be outward occurrences, or changing institutions and phases of opinion. Hence the circumstances under which a book was composed will leave their impress upon it. The most cunning hand is scarcely equal to the task of carrying through a deception, unless criticism slumbers. Anachronisms will infallibly creep into the counterfeited work, and betray its artificial origin. Therefore, characteristics of the kind specified serve as a criterion of the genuineness of books, which is independent of external testimony, and has a convincing force for the reason that such peculiarities are plainly not the product of contrivance. They are too deeply woven into the texture of the work. They are introduced with no consciousness, on the part of writers, of their bearing on questions of date and authorship. They constitute, as it were, the atmosphere that sur-

rounds a literary production. They tell a tale, like peculiarities of language and accent. "Thou art a Galilean: thy speech bewrayeth thee," was the remark of the servant to Peter. With a like certainty literary fraud will unmask itself, from the impossibility of assuming the features of verity to which I have referred.

The New Testament histories abound in references, many of them quite casual, to customs, manners, incidents, geographical and political facts—to a myriad aspects of society—which identify the time when the books were written. Besides a great variety of circumstances of this general nature, there are certain other internal peculiarities, which are less obvious, since they do not lie on the surface, but which point convincingly to one conclusion—that which affirms the genuineness, or early date, of the books to which they pertain. These considerations are not all of equal weight in their bearing on the different historical books of the New Testament; but the proper discriminations can be made as we proceed.

I. We call attention to the hopes and expectations of the Apostles respecting the Second Advent of Christ, as they are disclosed in the New Testament writings. It is clear that the Disciples, during the life-time of their Master, notwithstanding the spirituality that belonged to them, when compared with their countrymen generally, shared in the prevalent expectation of a Messianic kingdom to be inaugurated in visible might and majesty. The impression made on their hearts by the moral and religious teaching of Christ, the personal attraction which He exerted upon them, in conjunction with the miracles which left them in no doubt as to His divine mission and the resources of His power, held them in their loyalty to Him, when others, their sanguine hopes of an external demonstration being disappointed, forsook Him. But the Disciples, the chosen com-

pany, were so firmly wedded to their old conception of the kingdom that they could not be made to believe that Christ was to suffer and die. His reiterated intimations and assurances on this topic fell on deaf ears. If they attracted notice at all, it was only to call forth, as in the case of Peter, a zealous protest (Matt. xvi. 22, Mark viii. 32). When they saw Him die, a victim of the power and malice of the Jewish authorities, they "mourned and wept" (Mark xvi. 10), not only for the personal bereavement which they had suffered, but from the apparent wreck of their hopes. The ambitious feeling which had prompted them, at an earlier day, to contend as rival aspirants for the principal posts of honor in the kingdom about to be ushered in, as they supposed, with imposing splendor, might dwindle, or disappear, under the Master's pure teaching and example. But the underlying idea of a Messiah who was literally to sit upon the throne of David was more slowly surrendered. After His resurrection, they put the anxious question: "Wilt Thou at this time, restore the kingdom to Israel?"[1] That, as they imagined was the end and aim of His reappearance. It was the goal towards which their eyes were directed. With these ideas and aspirations, it was natural that they should dwell with eager interest upon His teaching relative to His second coming. Then, if not before, the glory of the Messiah would be fully displayed. This event was naturally the object of their fond anticipation. They stood gazing up into heaven. Their yearning for the absent Lord mingled itself with their conviction that the Messiah's work was incomplete until there should be a stupendous manifestation of power in connection with it. Every hour's delay of His coming was a painful postponement of a wish that pined for its fulfilment. The day could not be distant

[1] Acts i. 6.

when every eye would behold His glory; when they would rejoice once more in His visible presence. This expectation is expressed by all of the Apostles in terms which fairly admit of no other interpretation. It is found in Paul (Rom. xiii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. vii. 29, 31; x. 11; Phil. iv. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 14). It is true that in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul cautions those to whom he is writing, against the notion, which had caused no little agitation among them, that Christ was to appear immediately (ii. 2, 3); but his language, at the same time, implies that the coming of the Lord is not far off; the preliminary signs were beginning to be seen (ii. 7, 8). The same expectation is expressed in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. x. 25, 37); in the Epistle of James (v. 3, 8); in the Epistles of Peter, (1 Peter iv. 7, 2 Peter iii. 3); in the Epistle of Jude (ver. 18), in the First Epistle of John (ii. 18), and in the Apocalypse (i. 1, iii. 11, xxii. 7, 12, 20). To put any other construction on these passages, as if the Parusia to which they refer, were anything else than the Second Advent of the Lord to Judgment, would introduce a dangerous license in interpretation, and one which might be employed to subvert the principal doctrines of the Christian system.[1]

Under the general expectation of the Apostles, mistaken

[1] Prof. Lightfoot, on the *Philippians*, commenting on ch. iv. 5, says: "The nearness of the Lord's Advent is assigned as a reason for patient forbearance. So similarly in St. James, v. 8 . . . . . The expression, *ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς* is the Apostle's watchword. In 1 Cor. xvi an Aramaic equivalent is given, *Μαρὰν ἀθά*, whence we may infer that it was a familiar form of recognition and warning in the early Church. Compare Barnab. § 21 . . . . See also Luke xxi. 31, 1 Peter iv. 7." Meyer, on Romans xiii. 11, says: "*ἡ σωτηρία, das Messiasheil*, that is, thought of in its perfection, as it comes in through the Parûsia, which Paul, in common with the whole Apostolic Church, conceived of as near and to come during the lifetime of that generation. Compare Phil. iv. 5; 1 Peter iv. 7."

though it might prove to be in the one particular of time, there lay a fundamental truth. The Apostle Paul, speaking of transgressions of the people of God under the old dispensation, says (1 Cor. x. 11): "They are written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world"—of the ages, the last times of the world's history—"are come." On this passage, Neander remarks: "He regards the final catastrophe as near, and all the early history of the kingdom of God as having been recorded as an admonitory example for the last time. In this view, the Apostle was warranted, even though he held the Last Time to be much shorter than it was to be. Christianity is the goal and end of all earlier revelations, and no other revelation follows upon it. Herein is the right given to the Christian to consider himself as the goal to which Revelation, in the whole previous course of its development, points and ministers." [1]

When we turn to the teaching of Christ, we find, in the first place, that the time of the Second Advent and consummation of the kingdom, He declares to be not a subject of Revelation. That day and hour were known neither to man nor angel, nor to the Son, but to the Father only (Matt. xxiv. 36; cf. Mark xiv. 32). It is doubtful whether this passage should be understood as relating solely to the precise point of time—the day of the month, and the hour of the day—when the event in question was to occur. The meaning may be that the time in general was known only to God. This is said in an unequivocal form, in the words of Christ to the Apostles, at a later day: "It is not for you to know the times and seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts i. 7). That event belonged to those future things into which human curiosity might not pry. They were to be learned, in particular the date of their occurrence was to be ascertained, only as the plan of Provi-

[1] *Corintherbriefe*, p. 164.

dence should be unfolded to human eyes in actual history. It is worthy of remark that when the Apostle Paul utters recommendations which were prompted by his expectation of the Second Advent as near, he disclaims for them the authority derived from inspiration, and attaches to them no higher sanction than may be warranted by his own judgment as a man.[1] Whatever he may hope and may think, he does not claim to know with certainty what has not been revealed, or to issue injunctions upon divine authority which have no higher source than his own personal convictions.

In the second place, there is much of the teaching of Christ which implies a moral progress of the Gospel in the world, to extend through a long period of time. This is the impression made, for example, by the general tone of the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. We should gather from the words of Christ, on various occasions, that an influence has been set at work which is gradually to permeate society. He compares the future effect of Christianity to that of leaven, which by degrees assimilates to itself the mass in which it is deposited. It is hidden in the dough, it is obscure, insignificant in quantity, but by a slow and silent operation it spreads through all the measures of meal in which it is placed. He compares Christianity, also, to a grain of mustard-seed—the least of all seeds—which grows into a tree affording lodgment to the birds of the air.[2] These illustrations point to something directly opposite to a speedy, abrupt, miraculous termination to be put to the moral progress of Christian truth. In the same vein, Christ likens Himself to the farmer who sows the seed, and leaves it to spring up in its own time and way,—first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.[3] He bade the Apostles go forth, and

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 25. [2] Matt. xiii. 31, 32. [3] Mark iv. 28.

preach the Gospel to all nations.[1] He foretold, as Matthew relates, that many would come from the East and from the West—from all quarters of the Gentile world—and find admission into His kingdom. In the Parable of the Wedding Feast, He warned His hearers that the destruction of Jerusalem would be the signal for the wide diffusion of the Gospel among the heathen.[2] The messengers are to go to the highways and the hedges to procure guests for the Feast. In the Parable of the Householder,[3] the husbandmen who kill his son, are to be themselves destroyed, and the vineyard is to be delivered to other husbandmen. To remove all doubts as to the meaning of the Parable, it is added: "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." At the destruction of Jerusalem, the centre of the kingdom will pass over from the Jewish theocracy to the Christian Church. These are among the proofs that Christ anticipated a gradual progress of the Gospel on the earth, to be continued after the Jewish nation had been broken up.

Nevertheless, the Apostles, as we have seen, cherished the hope and expectation that the Lord would soon return,—an expectation that was not extinguished by the disappointment of it in the first age of Christianity, but is expressed in most of the Fathers of the second century; for Origen, who died in 254, appears to have been the first to suggest that the Gospel by its own moral power, through the Spirit, would overcome heathenism in the Roman Empire.

It is not strange that this expectation, which appears so distinctly and frequently in the Epistles, should tinge the phraseology in which the Evangelists record the prophetic utterances of Jesus. That a verbal exactitude belongs

[1] Matt. xxviii. 19. [2] Matt. xxii. 7–10. [3] Matt. xxi. 33–42.

always to these reports of the Saviour's teaching is claimed by no intelligent person who has compared the Gospels with one another. Jesus taught in the Aramaic dialect; His teaching was transmitted orally, for a time, before it was embodied in a written form; His sayings are often condensed by the Evangelists, and given in an order not corresponding precisely to that in which they were uttered.[1]

The Jews, in their habitual conceptions and language, drew a sharp line of division between the pre-Messianic and the Messianic times, between the present order of things (*αἰὼν οὗτος*), and the order of things to follow the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom (*αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος* or *μέλλων*). This distinction appears everywhere in the New Testament. Hence, while the kingdom, in one sense, was present, and was actually introduced when Christ wore the form of a servant, and was on the earth with His disciples, it was nevertheless still to come. Its full manifestation, and its consummation, were in the future. The Advent of the Messiah was to be at the junction of the two periods, at the close of the present Æon (*συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*). This phrase, "the end of the world"—in one passage, in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[2] is connected with the Saviour's death; but this is represented as occurring in the "last days" of the earlier Æon. Elsewhere, it occurs only in Matthew, and in all cases plainly refers to an event in the future, subsequent to the death and resurrection of the Lord.[3] It refers to the Advent to Judgment. To this the question in Matthew relates:[4] "What shall be the sign of thy Coming and of the End of the World"—(*συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*)? The temple, with the stately and splendid buildings connected

[1] See the remarks of Farrar, *Life of Christ*, pp. 258, 260.
[2] Heb. ix. 26. [3] Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20.
[4] Matt. xxiv. 3.

with it, were to be leveled to the earth. "Tell us," they said, "when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" The form of the questions indicates that the two events were thought of as simultaneous. The "great tribulation" (ver. 21) which was to attend the destruction of Jerusalem is described, and "immediately (εὐθέως) after the tribulation of those days" (ver. 29), the Son of Man is to come to judgment. All these things are to be accomplished before "this generation shall have passed away;" the term (γενεά) signifying what we mean by generation, there being three, according to Herodotus, in a century. It is explained elsewhere by equivalent phrases.[1] In Luke and Mark, only the first of the questions is put by the Disciples; but the Advent to Judgment forms one theme of the discourse which follows. In Mark there is mention of the unequaled tribulation (θλίψις) "in those days" (xiii. 19), when the temple shall be profaned; and it is added (ver. 24), "in those days," "after that tribulation"—the word "immediately," (εὐθέως) is wanting—the Son of Man will appear to Judgment; and "this generation shall not pass till all these things be done" (ver. 30). In Luke, the phraseology of the discourse varies considerably from the form in Matthew and Mark. The siege of Jerusalem is predicted in more definite terms: the city is to be compassed with armies.[2] Intervening between its capture and the Second Advent, Jerusalem is to be trampled under foot of the Gentiles, until "the times of the Gentiles"—the times appointed for the execution of the divine judgments upon the guilty city—shall have run out. But Luke goes on at once to the prediction of the Second Advent, and adds: "This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled" (ver. 32).

To account for the juxtaposition, in the Synoptists, of

[1] Matt. xvi. 28.

[2] Luke xxi. 20.

the two events, the destruction of the temple, and the Parusia, it is natural to suppose that Jesus may have contemplated both of these events in the same prophetic description, without, however, affirming that they were to be contemporaneous in their actual occurrence.[1] The ancient prophets predict the deliverance of the Jews from Babylon, and pass at once, as if no time were to intervene, to the great redemption to be accomplished by the Messiah, and to the prevalence of righteousness and peace on the earth. In the perspective of prophecy, the intervening space fades out of view. We are precluded from attributing this mode of vision to Jesus, both by our general conception of his clear insight, and by specific passages to which reference has been made. Nor is there any place in the New Testament in which the agency of Christ in the destruction of Jerusalem is spoken of as an advent. Nevertheless,

[1] This is the view of some of the ablest exegetical scholars: "It is easily explicable how it would happen that in the apprehension and repetition of such discourses, from the point of view of the hearers, elements were blended together, which Christ—though exhibiting them in a certain correspondence to each other, and without assigning to them specific measures of time—nevertheless kept apart." Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 659.

"Nous n'avons aucun scruple à reconnâitre que dans l'ardeur de leur attente du retour immédiat de Jésus, ils sont appliqué à ce retour ce que rapportait uniquement à la ruine de Jérusalem. Toutes les explications destinées á attenuer cette difficulté ne parviennent qu'à la tourner sans la faire disparaître." De Pressensé, *Jésus Christ, Son Temps, Sa vie, Son Oeuvre*, p. 188. See, also, Godet's *Commentary on Luke*, Eng. tr. ii. p. 260.

Dr. Farrar says: "The Evangelists have not clearly distinguished between the passages in which He (Christ) is referring more prominently to one than the other"—that is, to the fall of the Jewish polity and dispensation, and to the End of the World. "Their abbreviations of what Jesus uttered, and the sequence which they gave to the order of His utterances, were to a certain extent tinged by their own subjectivity—possibly even by their own natural supposition—that the second horizon lay nearer to the first than it actually did in the designs of heaven." *Life of Christ*, ii. 260.

that He should speak, in the same discourse, of two great events, homogeneous in some striking points, the end of the Jewish dispensation, and the end of all things, the prediction of the last having a germinant and typical fulfillment in the first, was natural.[1]

We find in the Synoptists, that He described the triumphant spread of the Gospel as an Advent, and in imagery similar to that found in the eschatological discourse. To the High Priest, he said: "Hereafter"—or, to translate more correctly—"from this time onward, shall ye see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven."[2] Here was to be a coming, a continuous coming, beginning from that moment. An analogous use of like imagery is seen in the assurance of Jesus to Nathanael: "Hereafter"—from this time onward—"ye shall see Heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man:"[3] the reference being to the proofs of a living and constant intercourse with God on the part of Jesus, which the Disciple was to witness—for example, in the miracles.

In John's Gospel, there is no allusion to the destruction of the temple as an immediate precursor of the judgment. But the impartation of the Holy Ghost, and the great effects to result from it, are designated as a Coming of Christ.[4] If Jesus used this language as a description of other epochs in the development of the kingdom, language

[1] Baur thinks that Jesus did not predict the downfall of Jerusalem at all. He founds his opinion on Rev. xi. 2 seq., where John appears not to expect the destruction of the city, or the temple. *N. T. Theolog.*, p. 108. But it is not so clear that we have in this passage an Apostolic testimony of the import supposed, as to neutralize the authority of the Synoptists on this point. Besides, there is other evidence that Jesus foretold the downfall of the temple. See above, p. 342. See also 1 Thess. ii. 14–17. [2] Matt. xxvi. 64. [3] John i. 51.

[4] John xiv. 18 seq., xvi. 16, 20 seq.; cf. Eph. ii. 17.

closely resembling that which denoted also the final Parusia, the expectation might arise that this final Coming was near at hand.[1] It is not more remarkable that the Disciples were left to a misapprehension on this point than that they were left, for a time, in a like error as to the perpetual obligation of the Mosaic ceremonies. The Church, including the Apostles themselves, was to be enlightened gradually as to the real purport of the Master's teaching, by the influence of the Spirit, and by the actual course of Divine Providence. Especially is it true of His prophetic utterances, which offered glimpses, for practical ends, and under symbolical forms, of the future of His kingdom, the full meaning of which time alone could unveil.

Whatever difficulties or differences may exist on subordinate questions of interpretation, the proposition stands firm that the association of the destruction of Jerusalem and the last Judgment, in the manner and form in which they are connected in the First Gospel, could not exist, had this Gospel been written after the first of these events had taken place.[2] There would surely have been some explanation, some hint that an interval was to occur, in the room of the declarations which we actually find. The conclusion is inevitable that this Gospel was extant, in its present form, prior to A. D. 70, the date of the capture of the city

[1] See Meyer, *Evang. Matt., Anmerkk.*, p. 510 seq., and Bleek's lucid and candid discussion, *Synoptisch. Erkl. d. drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 351 seq. In the Gospel of John, there are distinct references to the Coming of Christ at the Resurrection and Judgment (vi. 40, 54, v. 28; xiv. 3). But this is not referred to as near (vi. 39 seq., 44, 54); while the Coming, through the Spirit, is described as near at hand (xiv. 15–18). It is worthy of note that in the writings of Paul, none of the references to the Second Advent is coupled with the destruction of Jerusalem as an immediate precursor. To this last event he may refer in 1 Thess. ii. 14-17.

[2] "L' εὐθέως du premier évangile n'est plus possible après la ruine de Jérusalem." Pressensé, *Jésus Christ, sa Vie*, etc., p. 201 n.

by Titus. Baur has attempted to refer the prediction to Hadrian, but in this he has had little support. He admits that the parallel passages must relate to the siege of Titus; that the statements in Luke admit of no other construction.[1] But Matthew is also explicit: it was the destruction of the temple to which the question of the disciples was directed. We obtain then the result that the First Gospel was composed, in its present form, within the lifetime of the disciples and companions of Christ. This conclusion shuts out the mythical theory, and every other hypothesis that has been broached for the purpose of discrediting the miracles of Jesus. The main thing in the vindication of the New Testament history is to show that we have contemporary evidence, the best possible evidence for the establishment of historical facts. There are other proofs of the early date of the First Gospel, but there is none more adapted to impress conviction upon a critical student than the one just described.

The character of the parallel statements in Mark, although, as we have said, they vary somewhat from those of Matthew, justifies the same conclusion respecting the date of the Second Gospel. It must have preceded the destruction of Jerusalem by the forces of Titus.

The phraseology of Luke is not such as to necessitate this conclusion with regard to the Third Gospel. The duration of "the times of the Gentiles" is not defined. Yet here it is possible to affirm with safety that it was written very near to the date when the Roman army under Titus captured the city. The generation that heard the teaching of Jesus had not passed off the stage. This fact concerning the Third Gospel fixes approximatively the date of the Book of Acts, which, beyond all question, was composed by the same author. It is utterly impossible to carry

[1] Baur, *N. T. Theologie*, p. 316.

forward the date of the composition of the Acts into the second century. Like the Third Gospel, it is the production of a contemporary of the Apostles.

John, the last of the Evangelists, whose Gospel, according to the ecclesiastical tradition, was written later in the first century, does not introduce the eschatological discourse on which we have commented. Yet he refers, in one place, to the Second Advent, in such a manner as to afford some corroboration to the argument for the genuineness of the Fourth Gospel. Christ, after His Resurrection, foretells to Peter the martyrdom which that Apostle is to suffer; and in reply to Peter's inquiry as to the lot that was to befall John, He made an answer which gave rise to the opinion that the Apostle was to survive until the second coming of his Master. But this inference, the Evangelist adds, was without warrant, as Jesus had simply put the question, by way of rebuke to Peter's curiosity: "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" (John xxi. 18. 24). It seems more natural to suppose that the record was made to remove an erroneous impression while John was still living. Had John died before, the fact would, probably, have been indicated.

With respect to the first three Gospels, it must be remembered that we have in them substantially one tradition—the Galilean tradition—of the doings and sayings of Christ. In the First Gospel, where the terms connecting the fall of Jerusalem and the second Advent are most precise, there are traces of a grouping of the Lord's discourses, without the strict observance of chronology. When we compare Matthew and Luke, we find the Sermon on the Mount in both, but a portion of the matter which the first Evangelist places under this head, is elsewhere distributed by Luke.[1] Thus the Lord's Prayer is given by Luke, in

[1] That in Matthew other discourses are connected with the Sermon on

connection with another occasion, when the Disciples requested Jesus to teach them how to pray, as John had taught his followers (Luke xi. 1–4). It is true that Christ may have twice given to His disciples the same form of supplication, each Evangelist passing over in silence the occasion which the other records; but this hypothesis appears less probable. In Luke, there is no reference, either on the part of Christ, or of the Disciples, to the supposed fact that they had already received from him a form of prayer. In the thirteenth chapter of Matthew, there is a collection of parables pertaining to the kingdom of God, three of which —that of the pearl, the treasure, and the net—are wanting in the parallel passage in Mark. Mark, to be sure, refers to other parables uttered by Christ, but the reference is probably to parables uttered on other occasions. If, in setting down the eschatological teaching of Christ, the first Evangelist, likewise, has brought together sayings uttered on different occasions, there is a larger room for the influence of personal expectations, in the arrangement of the matter and in the turn of phraseology.

II. We call attention to the references in the New Testament to the organization and polity of the Church.

The Church was a society, and as such had an external coherence from the beginning. But its form of organization was a thing of gradual growth. It went through stages of development, not being prescribed in its details at the outset, but taking on one feature after another, as the spread of the Christian community, and new emergencies, prompted. How far the changes of polity in post-apostolic times were

the Mount, Calvin had the acuteness to perceive. He says: "Sufficere enim piis et modestis lectoribus debet, quod hic ante oculos positam habeant summam doctrinæ Christi collectam ex pluribus et diversis concionibus quarum hæc prima fuit, ubi de beatitudine disseruit apud discipulos." *Opera* (Amst. ed.) vi. 64.

normal, justified by the principles of Christianity, is a question not pertinent here. As far as we speak of mutations of polity, we refer to them as facts generally conceded, and waive special controversies that are often connected with the subject. It is admitted on all hands that ecclesiastical arrangements in the age of the Apostles were not precisely the same that they were in the age that followed, that the second century, in this particular, was not an exact copy of the first.

There are two points in relation to the polity of the post-apostolic period, which we are here concerned to notice. The first is the precedence of a bishop over the presbyters, or elders, in each church. Whether this arrangement was effected by an Apostolic ordinance, as some maintain, or whether it arose naturally, from the force of circumstances, is a matter that we now leave untouched. This much is conceded at the present day by competent scholars, that the governing body, under the Apostles, in each church, in the Apostolic age, or, at least, until the latter section of that age, was made up of coequal presbyters. This is, also, conceded that when we pass to the post-apostolic writers, to the writers of the second century, we find traces of that changed organization to which I have adverted. Polycarp is called bishop of Smyrna, by his pupil, Irenæus, Polycarp having been a disciple of John, the Apostle; and Clement is styled the bishop of Rome; and Papias is commonly designated by the writers after him as the bishop of Hierapolis. It may be a fair subject of discussion what degree of precedence over the presbyters was allowed to these individuals, or claimed by them. Especially may it be doubted whether that precedence, whatever its nature was, existed universally, —whether it existed, for example, in the Church of Corinth, at the time when Clement of Rome wrote his Epistle, at Philippi when Polycarp addressed the Church there, or even in

the Church of Rome, to which one of the Ignatian Epistles is directed.[1] But all candid scholars must concede that the episcopal arrangement, in the form described, may be traced back to the verge of the Apostolic age, if not beyond, and that early in the second century it had become widely established. The shorter Greek Epistles of Ignatius are probably genuine. If we accept these, or even the three Syriac Epistles of this Father—the three which are found in a Syriac version, and in the form in which they stand there—we must allow that the precedence of the bishop was an established feature in the polity of the churches of Antioch and Asia Minor, in the first decade of the second century. There is nothing to contradict this supposition. Irenæus, who wrote in the last quarter of the century, knows of no different organization of the Church as having ever existed. He even erroneously speaks of the elders who bade adieu to Paul at Miletus as being the bishops of the churches about Ephesus.[2] The bishop is called a presbyter by Irenæus, but the presbyter is not called a bishop. As far as he is concerned, vestiges of the original identity of the two terms and offices have mostly disappeared; and Irenæus, it should be observed, was a youth in the middle of the second century.

The next point to be mentioned concerning the second century, is the prominence of questions relating to ecclesiastical government. As the territory and members of the Church were enlarged, as persecutions became more formidable, and as heresies and divisions arose, more attention was directed to ecclesiastical unity and discipline. Whether tendencies of thought within the Church itself, that did not conduce to the interests of a pure Christianity, especially the rise of a sacerdotal theory of the ministry, may not have acted in the same direction, is an inquiry

[1] These points are considered in ch. xvii. of this work.

[2] Adv. Hær., III. xiv. 2.

which we have no occasion here to pursue. Of the general fact of the increasing prominence of purely ecclesiastical arrangements, after we cross the boundaries of the second century, there is no dispute.

Let us turn now to the New Testament, beginning with the Gospels. Here we find scarcely any references to the matter of church organization. The very word "church" (ἐκκλησία) occurs but twice, and, in both instances, in the Gospel of Matthew. The first passage is the declaration to Peter, in his character of a confessor of the faith in the Son of God: "On this rock will I build my church" (xvi. 18). The second is the direction to report the offence of a brother disciple to the "church," in case he pays no heed to private admonition (xviii. 17). The term corresponding to "church" (or ἐκκλησία) was familiar to readers of the Old Testament, as denoting the congregation of the people. Christ, in these passages, simply indicates that His followers are to be united in a community with mutual responsibilities,—a community which its enemies will not be able to destroy. Had the Gospels, or either of them, been produced in the second century, it is improbable that all foreshadowings of the later ecclesiasticism would have been excluded from them. The state of things which these authors found about them would have been thrown back, in some of its distinctive features, into the earlier period, or would, at least, have left some traces upon the narrative. In the book of Acts, we have a record of events occurring in the Apostolic age. It is worthy of remark that the Author gives no account whatever of the first institution of the eldership, the first appointment of elders in the church. This office appears, in the course of the narrative, as an existing feature of the polity of the church at Jerusalem, and of the church at Antioch; but of its introduction the writer has nothing to say. A later writer, casting his eye back

upon the Apostolic age, would have been far less likely to pass over a fact of this nature. But this point is of less moment. What is the actual polity of the Church, as described by the Author of the Acts? It should be remembered that we have in mind now, not formal statements, but incidental allusions. We find then that Luke knows of no distinction between the bishop and the elder. The terms are used indiscriminately. Apart from the superintendence of the Apostles, the eldership is the highest governing office. He describes the interview of Paul with the elders of the Ephesian church, at Miletus, and he styles them, or reports Paul as styling them, "bishops."[1] "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops"—"overseers" it is rendered in our version. As before remarked, this is so far removed from the conceptions of Irenæus, who was born as early as about A. D. 130, and from the Church constitution with which he had been familiar from childhood, that he imagines the elders at Miletus to have been bishops in the later, more restricted meaning of the title.[2] The term "bishops" is used by Luke in an entirely unstudied way, and it is connected with no explanation, as it might have been, had he been writing at a time when the constitution of the Church had been, in this particular, modified. It is obvious that when he wrote, the organization of the Church had not reached the form which it began to assume at the close of the Apostolic age, and which had spread far and wide early in the second century. The episcopate of which Ignatius, as early as about 110 A. D., makes so much, and which Irenæus and his contemporaries connect with the Apostles, did not yet exist.

The identity of bishops and presbyters is recognized in the same way throughout the New Testament writings.

[1] Acts xx. 17 seq.

[2] Adv. Hær., III. xiv. 2.

It is the "bishops and deacons" of the Church at Philippi, in connection with the other members, that Paul and Timothy address.[1] There are two classes of officers, and the higher wear the episcopal title. In writing to Timothy, Paul states the qualifications of "bishops" and "deacons," with no mention of any intermediate office (1 Tim. iii. 1 seq.; v. 8 seq.). Peter offers an exhortation to the elders of the churches of Asia Minor, that they should discharge faithfully the episcopal duty (ἐπισκοποῦντες) committed to them.[2] There can be no doubt that these passages indicate the constitution of the Church which was known to the New Testament writers.[3]

Moreover, what is said of the functions of the different officers of the Church, shows the early period to which these writers belong. These functions did not remain exactly the same. New prerogatives and duties were gradually attached to the several offices. This is not so marked, for a considerable time, with reference to the office of deacon. Yet, early in the second century, an important dignity is ascribed to the deacons by Ignatius,[4] although they did not preach.[5] Originally they were almoners of the Church's bounty. The narrative in the Acts informs us that their business was to "serve tables" (Acts vi. 2). They were to distribute alms to the poor and sick. They probably waited upon the table at the Feasts of Love, and at the Lord's Supper which was commemorated in connection with them. But nowhere in the New Testament is there any intimation that a higher, or a different, official duty belonged to them. If they preached, it was not in the charac-

[1] Phil. i. 1. [2] 1 Peter v. 2.

[3] The Apocalypse is no exception, as the "angels" do not denote bishops. See Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 197 seq.

[4] Epistt. *ad. Trall.* ii., iii., *ad. Magn.* vi., *ad. Smyrn.* vii.

[5] See Bingham's *Antiquities*, xiv. 4, § 1.

ter of deacons, or in virtue of holding this office. The office of presbyter did not remain unchanged. Like the corresponding office in the synagogue, it was originally a ruling function. At the outset, it does not appear that the elders were chosen with primary and express reference to teaching; much less that they were exclusively empowered to fulfill this work. Paul counts the elders who labor "in word and doctrine," that is, who teach, worthy of special esteem (1 Tim. v. 17). This passage implies that the elders might not all engage in teaching. Yet, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, the same persons are designated "pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv. 11); and Paul enumerates (1 Tim. iii. 2) among the qualities of a bishop that he should be "apt to teach." We see, from these passages, how the teaching function came by degrees to be associated with the office of presbyter, as a necessary element. In the period when the Acts and the Epistles of Paul were written, the office is ripening into that form which it afterwards wore. No writer of the age immediately following that of the Apostles, would think of specifying the ability to teach as a desirable quality in a presbyter or bishop, as if the office might be bestowed on those not exercising or possessing this gift.

On the whole, the ecclesiastical arrangements which are brought to light in the New Testament writings, and more particularly in the histories, belong to an earlier era, a lower stratum, than those which discover themselves in the writers of the second century.

III. We have now to consider the heretical parties which sprang up in the early Church, and the bearing of these phenomena on the determination of the date of the New Testament books.

The two formidable perversions of Christianity, against which the Church had to struggle, were the Ebionitic or

Judaizing, and the Gnostic. The former emanated from the Jewish side, and would have amalgamated Christianity with Judaism, converting the Church into a Jewish sect. The latter was the fruit of speculation, largely from heathen sources, and would have turned the Church into a philosophical school, and confounded the Gospel in a strange union with other religions, and with speculative systems alien to its nature. The great battle of the second century was with the Gnostics, whose various leaders, with their different schemes of doctrine, are fully delineated on the pages of Irenæus, and by his pupil Hippolytus. The precise date of the Ebionitic separation, when the Judaizers formed themselves into distinct organizations at war with the Church, we cannot determine with certainty. There is no doubt that the destruction of the temple by Titus, and the events of the Jewish war, tended to precipitate this result. The drift of events was such as to force those who had clung to the Mosaic observances to a choice between the abandonment of them and a coalescence with the Gentile churches, or a movement in the direction of schism and isolation. Hegesippus, the old Jewish-Christian historian, who wrote not far from A. D. 150, makes the first outbreaking of heresy and division in the Jerusalem Church to have occurred on the death of Simeon, the successor of James, in A. D. 108.[1] Whatever mistakes may stand in connection with this statement, there appears to be no reason for calling in question the chronological datum. Justin, in his Dialogue with Trypho, which was written not long after the decree of Hadrian, forbidding Jewish worship in Jerusalem—that is, not long after A. D. 135—was acquainted with both branches of the Judaizing faction, the Nazarenes, and the stricter Ebionites.[2]

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 32.

[2] Dial. c. Trypho, 46, 48. See below, p. 498.

Gnosticism, however obscure and varied in some of the forms which it assumed, was marked by certain distinct features. It was the offspring of a partly practical and partly speculative tendency, now the one element, and now the other, having the preponderance. The desire to pry into the mystery of creation and the mystery of evil, was one prevailing characteristic of this heresy. Evil was associated with matter. Hence matter was cut off from any relation to the Supreme God. This was one corollary; and asceticism which, by a natural oscillation, might pass into the opposite extreme of antinomian self-indulgence, was another consequence of the view taken of the material side of our being. Gnosticism boasted of a "wisdom"—γνῶσις—peculiar to its votaries; a higher insight into divine things. This was its first note. It would thus create an oligarchy of philosophers or devotees. In this particular, it stood upon a level with heathen philosophy generally, and in opposition to the Gospel. Secondly, the Gnostics agreed in attributing the world in which we live to an Angel, or a Demiurge, inferior to the infinite God. To bridge over the gulf between the ineffable One, who is elevated above all contact with matter, they laid hold of the notion of emanation, and postulated a series of beings standing in genetic connection with one another—forming a chain which proceeded from the supreme Deity, but the links of which, the farther they descended, were more and more separated from His pure essence. To one of these lower beings, the present order of things, to which we belong, was attributed. He was the God of the Jews, who was conceived of either as carrying out, though imperfectly, in partial ignorance, the designs of the Supreme, or as in Satanic hostility to Him. The end and goal of all aspiration is deliverance from the bonds of matter and of the Demiurge. The Gnostic antipathy to matter, and

the dualism involved in it, extended its influence to the conception of Christ's person. The human Jesus was separated from the Heavenly Christ, so that in the room of a real incarnation, there was a temporary conjunction of the two. Docetism, in the form of a theory that He wore the mere semblance of a body, was the final outcome of this method of speculation.

In Gnosticism of the less radical type—that type which made the Demiurge inferior, but not antagonistic, to the Supreme God—several phases or gradations may be distinguished.

Cerinthus, the first noted leader in this heretical movement, was active in Asia Minor in the closing years of the first century. He came from Alexandria. He held that below the Supreme Deity is a series of angels, one of whom, who was ignorant of the Most High God, was the Creator of the world by whom the Mosaic Law was given to the Jews.[1] Jesus he held to be the son of Joseph and Mary. With him, at his baptism, the heavenly Christ united Himself, but continued with him only up to the time when His sufferings commenced. With these Gnostic characteristics were blended Judaic peculiarities. His conception of Christ was Ebionitic. He is supposed to have included in his system the practice of circumcision and the observance of the Sabbath. And his sensuous Chiliasm, or theory of an earthly Millennium,[2] was thoroughly Judaic in its character, and utterly diverse from the later forms of Gnosticism. The Gnosticism of Cerinthus was

[1] Et Cerinthus autem quidam in Asia non a primo Deo factum esse mundum docuit, sed a virtute quadam valde separata et distante ab ea principalitate, quæ est super universa, et ignorante eum, qui est super omnia, Deum. Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, I. xxvi. 1: cf. Hippolyt., *Ref. omn. Hær.*, vii. 21, x. 17, Tertullian, *de Præscript.*, iii.

[2] Caius, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28, Dionys. Alexandr. ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 28.

thus, in some of its main points, Judaic. It had certain features strongly akin to the characteristics of the sect of Essenes. Whether adherents of this sect had made their way into Asia Minor, or whether the phenomena which we have in mind, sprang up independently, from a kindred tendency, it is clear that a sort of Gnosticism which may be termed Essenian, appeared there in the latter part of the first century.

If now we go forward into the second century, we find in the systems of Basilides, who taught at Alexandria about A. D., 125, and of Valentinus, who came from Alexandria to Rome about A. D. 140, an obvious and decided advance upon the comparatively simple scheme of Cerinthus. The demiurge is still the instrument, and not the opponent, of the Supreme, and the two dispensations are not yet represented as absolutely antagonistic to one another. But the peculiar Ebionitic and Judaic features of the doctrine of Cerinthus are dropped. A vast and complicated system of super-terrestrial beings, of whom the demiurge is one, are called into existence.

The question arises whether there are not traces of Gnostic phenomena, which precede Cerinthus,—that is to say, which are less developed and coherent than the dogmas of this heresiarch. Now such phenomena, gnostic opinions in the germ, do actually appear in certain books of the New Testament. We leave out of consideration here the Pastoral Epistles, where the incipient heresy is plainly delineated and condemned. We confine our attention to the Epistles to the Colossians and to the Ephesians. Especially in the former of these Epistles we find that the Apostle Paul censures a class of errorists who are not separated from the Church, but who cherish and inculcate notions evidently Gnostical in their character.[1] They pre-

[1] Compare, Prof. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 98 seq. It is true that the

tended to a "wisdom" above that of the generality of disciples.[1] There was an angelology, and a worship of angels, on which the Apostle animadverts with severity. And there grew out of the dualistic theory of these persons an asceticism which Paul likewise condemns, and which is by no means limited to the austerities for which a warrant might be sought in the Mosaic law. In the book of Revelation, which was written not far from the date of the Epistle to the Colossians, and in the region to which this Epistle was sent, the same false speculation is noticed as the source of an antinomian license.[2]

We may distinguish, then, these three stages in the Gnostic development, the germinant Gnosticism combated in the Epistle to the Colossians, the system of Cerinthus, and the subsequent systems of Basilides, Valentinus, and their followers.

What light do the successive phases of Gnosticism throw upon the date of the New Testament histories? The first three Gospels and the Acts are silent upon this heresy. But according to the ecclesiastical tradition, which on this point there is no sufficient reason to distrust, the Apostle John personally knew and personally opposed Cerinthus.[3]

When we open the Fourth Gospel, and the First Epistle of John, we see that doctrines directly hostile to those attributed to Cerinthus are emphatically asserted. The reality of the incarnation is affirmed, and those who deny

genuineness of the Epp. to the Colossians and the Ephesians has been questioned by various German critics, but on quite insufficient grounds. See Reuss, *Gesch. d. heiligen Schriften d. N. T.*, i. 107 seq., where the proofs of the Pauline authorship are convincingly stated.

[1] See the references in Lightfoot, *Ibid.*, p. 100.

[2] Rev. ii. 14, 20–22. Cf. 2 Peter, ii. 10 seq.; Jude 8.

[3] Irenæus, III. iii. 4. The anecdote of the Apostle meeting Cerinthus in a bath, was derived from Polycarp, though not directly communicated to Irenæus himself: "Et sunt qui audierunt eum dicentem," etc.

that Christ has come in the flesh are denounced as having the spirit of Antichrist. The statement of the Fathers that John had in mind the errors of Cerinthus is corroborated by the contents of these writings. Moreover, the conception of Christ which the Johannine writings present, is the same as that which Paul held up in the Epistle to the Colossians, as an antidote to the notion of angelic mediators with which the Gnostics peopled the "pleroma."[1] The theology of the Fourth Gospel, and of the 1st Epistle of John, in its bearing on the Gnostic errors, is just what we should expect, if these writings were composed, as the Church tradition affirms, between the date of the Epistle to the Colossians and the close of the first century. On the contrary, the internal features of the Basilidian and Valentinian schools, belong to a later epoch; and they are such, moreover, as presuppose an acquaintance on the part of their authors with the Johannine writings. They borrow the ideas and phraseology of John, and interweave them, in a distorted form, into their complex and fantastic creations.[1]

[1] So judges such a critic as Lipsius. See his article *Gnosis*, in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexicon, p. 504.

CHAPTER XII.

THE CRITICAL TREATMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT HISTORIES.

THE Scriptures have never failed to manifest their unique and transcendent power wherever there are minds at all susceptible to the influence of moral and religious truth. There is no higher evidence of Inspiration than this ability "to find us," as Coleridge has expressed it, in the deepest wants, the secret sins, and the profound aspirations of the soul. But while this effect of the Bible is general, the thorough and critical study of the Book has been confined to certain times, and to comparatively few individuals. There were scholars in the ancient Church. Origen, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theodore, Theodoret, and other names that might properly be associated with these, stand high on the roll of Biblical students. But through the long period of the middle ages, criticism was dormant. The scholastic theologians were too ignorant of the languages and of history to accomplish any thing of importance in this province of study. With the revival of learning, the Scriptures began once more to be examined in a scholarly spirit. The Reformation was largely due to this study, which the Renaissance had awakened. Men like Reuchlin and Erasmus paved the way for Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin. But at the Reformation, the Bible was acknowledged alike by both the great parties, the Protestant and the Roman Catholic. The conflict between them turned on the question whether the mediæval system of doctrine was, or was not,

sanctioned in the Scriptures, and the further question whether the interpretations decreed by the Church were binding on the individual. But when the authority of tradition was cast away, and the right of the Church and of the Pope to dictate the interpretation of the Sacred Books was denied, the effect must be to concentrate attention upon the Bible, and to cause it to be studied by Protestants with an absorbing earnestness. Religious feeling, with the intellectual awakening that attended it, could not fail to turn inquiry in this direction. Yet the contests of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were mainly doctrinal. For dispassionate, scholarly research upon matters not directly involved in the great controversy, there was not so much call, nor was the temper of the times favorable for work of this kind. The various religious parties were soon busy in formulating their tenets, and in embodying them in creeds. The scholarship of the Renaissance in Italy was largely rationalistic in its spirit; but this betrayed itself principally in the attitude assumed towards the doctrinal and ethical teaching of the Church. Luther, although his whole tone, his whole philosophy of religion, was antagonistic to what is properly called Rationalism, expressed himself with characteristic freedom upon questions relating to the canon, and to the relative merit of the books that enter into it. And these opinions, he did not hesitate, with a frankness equally characteristic, to introduce into the prefaces of his translation of the Bible. But remarks of this nature had no perceptible effect on the systems of Protestant theology in the period that ensued. The Bible having been made the Rule of Faith, nothing was tolerated that was supposed to imply any sort of blemish in it, or any possible doubt as to what books really belong to it. Calvin, notwithstanding his dogmatic rigor, had much of the genuine spirit of a scholar, and not seldom

shows in his commentaries a manly freedom from bondage to the letter. But to the distinguished Arminian scholars, Grotius, Le Clerc, and their associates, belongs the credit of being pioneers in directing the mingled lights of philology and history, in a scientific spirit, upon the Scriptures, and upon the literature of the early Church. Since the beginning of the eighteenth century, or from the time of Leibnitz, the relation of science—taking the term in the broadest sense, as the synonym of knowledge accurately ascertained by natural means—to the Bible, and to Revealed Religion, has been, whether consciously, or not, the one principal theme of philosophical and theological discussion. One branch of this comprehensive inquiry is Criticism—the investigation of the origin, authorship, and meaning of the several books of the Bible, and of the credibility of the history which it contains. Germany is the country where, for a century past, these studies have flourished most. That they are legitimate and necessary, no Protestant can deny. Surely the limits of the canon, and the meaning and credibility of Scripture, must be determined by authority, or by investigation. Rejecting the infallibility of tradition, we have no alternative but to determine these questions by historical and philological science. Nor can it be denied that rich contributions to knowledge, in this department, have been made, by the scholars of Germany, and in other countries where of late the same spirit of investigation has arisen. If there have been rash hypotheses without number, uncertified conjectures presumptuously put forward as established truth, speculations of a Pantheistic or Atheistic Rationalism arrogating the name of science, and bending history and scripture to conform to its theoretic bias, there have been, also, on the other hand, an exhaustive research, a patient investigation of every monument of the past that

could throw a ray of light upon the Scriptures, and upon the origin of Christianity, and not unfrequently a just and discriminating judgment, which have yielded the most valuable fruits. Honor to the scholars who have spent their lives in the unwearied effort to elucidate the documents of the Christian religion!

As regards the credibility of the Gospel history, it ought to be clearly understood that the modern attack by Baur, Strauss, Zeller and others, is founded upon an *à priori* assumption. It is taken for granted beforehand that whatever is supernatural is unhistorical. The testimony into which a miracle enters is stamped at once as incredible. Christianity, it was assumed, was an evolution of thought upon the natural plane. At a later day, Strauss fell into a materialistic way of thinking, which rendered him, if possible, more deaf to all the evidence which, if admitted, implies the supernatural. From the point of view taken by the skeptical school, therefore, the New Testament histories, so far as they relate to the wonderful works of Christ, and His Resurrection, and Manifestation to His Disciples after His death, must be discredited. But their principle, or prejudice, carries the negative critics farther. It must affect their judgment as to the authorship of the narratives which record the miracles. It is rendered difficult to believe, if not quite improbable, that these histories emanate from Apostles, eye-witnesses of the life of Jesus. The myths, or the consciously invented stories, the product of a theological "tendency" in the primitive Church, cannot well be ascribed to the immediate followers of Christ. The fact that the New Testament histories contain accounts of miracles, also tends to weaken and vitiate their general authority, in the estimation of the skeptical school. That is to say, the credulity of the Gospel writers, or their willingness to deceive, as evinced in the supernat-

ural elements embraced in their books, makes them less entitled to trust in their record of ordinary events into which the miracle does not enter. Such are the consequences, the logical and actual consequences, of the prepossession with which the critics to whom we refer approach the New Testament writings. How different the posture of those who put no such ban upon the supernatural, but whose minds are open to recognize a divine and miraculous element in the origination of Christianity! This diversity is well set forth in a passage of Neander, in which he is speaking of the conversion of Paul on the road to Damascus: "A transaction like this, from its very nature, will never admit of being proved in a way that is *universally* convincing. In order to be recognized in its reality, it is requisite that it should be looked upon from a certain point of view. Whoever is a stranger to this, must of necessity struggle against admitting the fact. In truth, for history in general there is no such thing as mathematical demonstration: faith, trust, is always called into requisition in the recognition of historical truth. The only question is, whether there is adequate ground for it, or more that challenges doubt. The decision depends upon the understanding of the facts, and of the whole province to which they belong. The provocation to doubt is the stronger in proportion as the nature of the transactions in question, and of the peculiar province to which they pertain, is foreign to the spirit of the observer, and the less these transactions are capable of being judged by the standard to which he is accustomed, and from the circle of experience familiar to him. Still more is the remark applicable to transactions which follow another law than that of the common course of nature, and in which a supernatural element is involved. Whoever thinks that everything must be explained by natural laws, being resolved to recog-

nize nothing supernatural, and is forced to take this ground by his whole philosophical system, will feel himself compelled to refer, also, the history of Paul's conversion to those common laws of nature, and to deny away everything that opposes them. It would be in vain to dispute with him about special points where the underlying principle of his whole theory has predetermined the course of his inquiry and its results."[1]

Connected with the unscientific assumption first noticed, other assumptions were adopted by the Tübingen school which are equally unsound. It was assumed that Christianity is an evolution of thought according to the scheme of the Hegelian logic, where it is held as a law that a doctrine in an undeveloped form must divaricate into two opposites, to be recombined afterwards in a higher unity. Thus it was assumed that Paulinism, and the sharply defined Judaizing system attributed to Peter, were the antagonistic types of opinion which sprang out of the seed of doctrine planted by Christ, and which were reunited in the old Catholic Theology, the evangelical legalism of the Fathers of the second century. The primitive form of Christianity, the teaching of Christ Himself, was hardly to be distinguished from Ebionitism, and was described by the Tübingen critics in such a way as to stand in no perceptible genetic relation to the system of Paul. This contracted idea of the scope and spirit of the teaching of Jesus, which finds no real link of connection between the Founder of Christianity and the Apostle Paul, is a prolific source of errors in the Tübingen school. The Tübingen theory can be supported only by making the Gospels the creations of a doctrinal or speculative tendency, conceived of as shaping and coloring facts to suit its own ends. When brought to the test, this theory of the Gospels breaks down signally.

[1] Pflanz. u. Leit. d. Kirche, i. 154.

The First Gospel, the Judæo-Christian Gospel, as it is pronounced, contains a variety of passages in which the catholic features of Christianity are set forth most impressively, sometimes in striking agreement with the fundamental ideas of Paul.[1] The homage paid by the heathen Magi to Christ is one of the first incidents which it records (ii. 1–11). The supplanting of the Jews by the heathen is even implied in a declaration quoted from John the Baptist (iii. 9). Mark, to which the Tübingen critics ascribed a late date, and a neutrality between the opposing tendencies which is the result of an avoidance of extremes already developed, is not only wrongly placed by them chronologically, but does not sustain this character of purposed neutrality which is attributed to it. Nor does the Gospel of Luke submit to the Procrustean bed which is framed for it. It contains passages not a few, which a theological partisan of the character with which the Author is credited could never have introduced. The contents of each of these Gospels forbid the assumption of a doctrinal purpose operating in the manner claimed, and vindicate their character as honest histories. This is not the conclusion of any extreme school of opinion; it is the deliberate judgment of critics like Holtzmann, Reuss, and Mangold, who on many questions of criticism and of theology are at a wide variance from traditional opinions. "Our Matthew, is to be sure, written by a Jewish Christian for Jewish Christians;" "but he has given us no Jewish Christian doctrinal product (tendenz-schrift)."[2] "The words of Jesus, quoted in Matthew, which form the doctrinal kernel of the book, are not

[1] Matt. xxiv. 14, xxviii. 19, viii. 12, xx. 1 seq., xxi. 28, 33; xxii. 40, xxiii. 33; ix. 16 seq., xii. 8, xiii. 31. Cf. *Essays on the Supernat. Origin of Christianity*, p. 213–215, and Reuss, *Gesch. d. heilig. Schrift.*, p. 195.

[2] Mangold in Bleek's *Einl.*, pp. 342, 343.

selected in the slightest degree from that point of view"—that of the Palestinian Jewish Christianity—"but go beyond it in a hundred places, and bespeak so much the more the faithfulness of the tradition."[1] Mark has decidedly outgrown Judaism, "but no dogmatic tendency can on this account be saddled upon his Representation of the Gospel history, as long as it is not shown that Christ Himself did not rise above Judaism, and that the Jewish Christian Matthew looks upon Christianity as a development within the limits of Judaism."[2] In Luke "not only does the history of Jesus get in general no other significance than in Matthew; nowhere does the design betray itself to set aside or to overcome an imperfect religious understanding of it. On the contrary, there occur numerous words and acts, drawn from the general tradition, which, when literally taken, rather bear on them a Jewish Christian tone. But here it will be nearest the truth to affirm that not a party feeling, but the most independent historical research, or, if one prefer it, a thirst for the fullest possible information, has collected together the matter."[3] As far as the first three Gospels are concerned, the impeachment of their historical credibility by the imputation of a theological bias, or a partisan doctrinal end, to their authors, has been utterly overthrown on the field of criticism. The book of Acts is of a piece in this respect with the Third Gospel. It remains to be seen whether there will not eventually be as great a degree of concurrence in favor of the historical credibility of the Fourth Gospel, and against the hypothesis of a theological "tendency" creating or warping facts for its support.

The school of which Strauss is the most famous representative, have carried on their war against the Evangel-

[1] Reuss, p. 194. [2] Mangold, p. 342; cf. Holtzmann, p. 384 seq.
[3] Reuss, p. 212.

ists by sophistical means. The aim has been to convict the Gospels of inconsistency and contradiction to such an extent as to make them untrustworthy, and to render the life of Jesus, beyond the most general outlines, utterly obscure and uncertain. One of the Evangelists is used to disprove the statement of another; and the second, in turn, is impeached on the authority of the first. The first Life of Christ by Strauss, his principal work, is full of examples of this circular reasoning. But, besides this transparent vice of logic, in the treatment of the details of the history, there is a flagitious disregard of the sound and acknowledged principles of historical criticism. Variations, however innocent, are magnified into an irreconcilable discordance. Peculiarities in the narratives, such as occur in the most authentic historical writers, are imputed by Baur and his followers to contrivance. All who pursue historical studies, all who take notice of testimony in courts, or even of ordinary conversation, know how many occasions there are for varying the form of a narrative, besides a want of knowledge, or of honesty in the narrator. The desire of brevity leads to the modification of the features of a transaction in the report of it. To give prominence to one element, or aspect, of the story, the order of circumstances may be changed. For the sake of making an event intelligible to a particular person, or class, or to give graphic force to the account of it, something may have to be added or subtracted. Thus a diversity of form may be produced, which yet involves no error. An unknown circumstance may be the missing link which unites testimony that is apparently discordant. The justice of these remarks, and the fallacy of the Straussian method of criticism, are best illustrated by examples drawn from ordinary history. As one instance, we may refer to two passages, in the last volume of the elder President Adams's Letters,

which were written with an interval of little more than a year between them:

(A.) To William Tudor.

Quincy, 5 June, 1817.

Mr. Otis, soon after my earliest acquaintance with him, lent me a summary of Greek Prosody, of his own collection and composition, a work of profound learning and great labor. I had it six months in my possession before I returned it. Since my return from Europe, I asked his daughter whether she had found that work among her father's manuscripts. She answered with a countenance of woe that you may more easily imagine than I can describe, that "she had not a line from her father's pen; that he had spent much time, and taken great pains to collect together all his letters and other papers, and in one of his unhappy moments, committed them all to the flames." I have used her own expressions.

(B.) To H. Niles.

Quincy, 14 June, 1818.

After my return from Europe, I asked his daughter whether she had found among her father's manuscripts a treatise on Greek Prosody. With hands and eyes uplifted, in a paroxysm of grief, she cried, "Oh! sir, I have not a line from my father's pen. I have not even his name in his own handwriting." When she was a little calmed, I asked her, "Who has his papers? where are they?" She answered, "They are no more. In one of those unhappy dispositions of mind which distressed him after his great misfortune, and a little before his death, he collected all his papers and pamphlets, and committed them to the flames. He was several days employed in it."

Suppose that these two narratives, instead of being from the pen of a modern writer, had been found by a critic of the Straussian type in the Gospels, the first of them being in one Evangelist, and the second in another. What a field for suspicion! What confident hypotheses should we have for the explanation of the phenomena in question! We should be told that document B is a product of exaggeration, founded on the simple story in A. The "countenance of woe," in A, is turned into "eyes uplifted," and a "paroxysm of grief," in B. The reply of the daughter is broken up into separate parts for "dramatic effect." The circumstance that "pamphlets" as well as "letters" and "papers"

are mentioned among the things destroyed, is an addition from the fancy of the second writer. The general view as to the relation of the two documents is confirmed beyond a question by the fact that the destruction of the papers is said in A to have been accomplished in "one of his unhappy moments," while B makes it the work of "several days." A, makes the collection of these materials for the flames occupy a prolonged period; B thinks that the impression would be more startling to represent the conflagration itself as long in duration. But why does B. omit the statement that the book of Prosody had been "six months" in the hands of the writer at a previous time? Obviously, because the disappointment at its destruction would be softened by the circumstance that Mr. Adams had already perused the work; and this would clash with the intention of the writer of B., who will paint the calamity in the liveliest colors. We appeal to any one who is conversant with modern critical works upon the Gospels, if this representation is not a fair parody of the procedure of the skeptical school in their handling of them. As it happens, in the present case, we know that both documents are from one hand, the hand of a writer of scrupulous veracity. The same fact is narrated in the one briefly, in the other more in detail. Both, considering the compass of each, and the end for which they were written, are accurate. When, in the first letter, Mr. Adams says that he has "used her own expressions," he does not mean to be understood as giving everything that she said, or the precise order in which her answers were spoken.

Let the reader take up any important event in ancient or modern history, which has been described by several writers, even in cases when they were eye-witnesses, and not unobservant or dishonest, and he will find variations

in matters of detail, which, to a great extent at least, might disappear, were the whole transaction presented to our view, and which, in any event, do not affect the substance of the narrative.

The death of Cicero is described by Plutarch and Appian, and is noticed also by Dion Cassius, Livy, and others. We set in parallel columns the two principal accounts:—

Plutarch, *Vita Ciceronis.*

But in the meantime the assassins were come with a band of soldiers, Herennius a centurion, and Popilius [Lænas] a tribune whom Cicero had formerly defended when prosecuted for the murder of his father. Finding the doors shut, they broke them open, and Cicero not appearing, and those within saying they knew not where he was, it is stated that a youth, who had been educated by Cicero in the liberal arts and sciences, an emancipated slave of his brother Quintus, Philologus by name, informed the tribune that the litter was on its way to the sea through the close and shady walks. The tribune, taking a few with him, ran to the place where he was to come out. And Cicero, perceiving Herennius running in the walks, commanded his servants to set down the litter; and stroking his chin, as he used to do, with his left hand, he looked steadfastly upon his murderers, his person covered with dust, his beard and hair untrimmed, and his face worn with troubles. So that the greatest part of those that stood by covered their faces whilst Herennius slew him. And thus was

Appian, *de Bellis Civ.* **IV. xix. xx.**

While now many people ran about here and there, inquiring if Cicero had been seen anywhere, and some, out of good-will and compassion for him, said: "He has already sailed and is out upon the sea," a shoemaker, a client of Clodius, the most bitter enemy of Cicero, pointed out the right way to Lænas, the centurion, who had a few soldiers with him. Lænas hurried after, and, at the sight of the servants, whom he saw to be of a greater number than his following, and prepared for resistance, made use of a soldier's stratagem, and called out: Centurions who are behind, hasten forward! By this means the servants, under the idea that more were coming, were struck with a panic (*καταπλάγησαν*). And Lænas, although he had once gained a cause by the aid of Cicero, dragging his head out of the litter severed it from the body, or rather, from want of skill, sawed it off, since he struck the neck three times. At the same time he cut off the hand with which Cicero had written those speeches against Antony as a tyrant, to which, after the example of Demosthenes,

he murdered, stretching forth his neck out of the litter, being now in his sixty-fourth year. Herennius cut off his head, and, by Antony's command, his hands also, by which the Philippics were written; for so Cicero styled those orations he wrote against Antony, and so they are called to this day. he gave the name of Philippics.

It will be observed that Plutarch states that it was a freedman of Quintus, named Philologus, who told the pursuers of Cicero what path he had taken. Appian, on the other hand, says that it was a shoemaker, a client of Claudius. Plutarch (with whom Livy agrees) says that Cicero stretched his head out of the litter; Appian says that Lænas pulled it out. Plutarch says that Herennius cut off the head; Appian that it was done by Lænas, awkwardly, in three blows—by sawing rather than cutting. Plutarch says that his hands were cut off, and Livy that the head was fastened to the rostrum between the two hands. Appian's statement is, that the hand was cut off which had written the Philippics,—that is, the right hand. Appian states that the servants of Cicero were dismayed by the shout of Lænas, which implied the presence of a strong force near. But Plutarch informs us that Cicero directed the litter to be set down; and Livy adds to this that he commanded the bearers of it to make no resistance.[1] Dio states not only that it was Lænas who cut off the head, but that he kept the skull near to a garlanded image of himself, in order that he might have the credit of the deed.[2]

That memorable scene in English history when Oliver

[1] "Satis constat . . . . . ipsum deponi lecticam et quietos pati quod fors iniqua cogeret jussisse." Fragment. ad. lib. CXX., ap. Seneca, *Suasoria*, vii.

[2] Hist., xlvii. 10.

Cromwell dispersed the Long Parliament, and locked the door, has been described by Whitelocke, Algernon Sidney, and Ludlow, the two former of whom were present, and the last, who was in Ireland, derived his information from eye-witnesses. There are various points of difference in these three narrations. For instance, Whitelocke says that Cromwell led a file of musketeers in with him, leaving the rest at the door and in the lobby. Ludlow says nothing of the introduction of the soldiers into the room where the house was sitting, until they were summoned in by Cromwell's order. Whitelocke says that Col. Harrison rose and took the speaker by the arm; Ludlow that he put his hand within the speaker's hand, and in this way assisted him out of the chair. These and other differences are enough to furnish a hostile critic with the means for a plausible attack upon the credibility, if not of the main event, of the leading circumstances attending the event. Yet, whoever will recur to Mr. Carlyle's or Mr. John Forster's description, will see that we are driven to no such unsatisfactory conclusion.

Nothing can be more unwarrantable and fallacious than to raise doubts respecting a whole transaction on account of real or seeming discrepancies that relate to a single feature of it. It is a controverted question who commanded the American forces at Bunker Hill. Some have said that it was Prescott, others have said that it was Putnam. Whatever the truth may be, whether it was the one, or the other, or neither, or both, this discrepancy in contemporary or later accounts, proves nothing against the reality of that occurrence which we call the Battle of Bunker's Hill. The preliminaries and main events of that engagement have been correctly reported. The difference in the writers as to who was the commander, may, perhaps, be adjusted, without the ascription of an actual error to any

of the authorities on which we depend for our knowledge of the event. Yet diversities of no more significance have often been made a pretext for impeaching the trustworthiness of the Gospel historians, and denying the reality of the various transactions which they record.

There is thus a proper sphere for the Harmonist. A consecutive narrative, and one as complete as the materials at our command render it possible to construct, of the life of Jesus, must be founded on a comparison of the four Gospels; just as a history of the Apostolic Age must rest upon the foundation of the book of Acts, and the Epistles studied in connection with it. The prejudice against the Harmonists as a class, which prevails widely even among scholars who have no disposition to reject the supernatural elements of the evangelical history, has its origin in extravagances of harmonistic writers. An extravagant conception of the nature and extent of inspiration as related to the historical writings of the New Testament has characterized this school. The inspiration of the Evangelists, instead of having its effect in an elevation of mind, and in spiritual insight, has been thought to secure an impeccability of memory,—to operate, like the demon of Socrates, in a negative way, and by holding them back from the slightest inaccuracy, to furnish a guaranty for the absolute correctness of all the minutiæ of the narrative. This perfection of memory and judgment—which Dr. Arnold says would imply the transference of divine attributes to men—has been considered an attribute of the Apostolic office. As three out of the five histories in the New Testament were not written by Apostles, it has been assumed that the relation of Mark to Peter, and of Luke to Paul, gives an Apostolic authority to these non-apostolic Evangelists. That the second and third Gospels, and the Acts, were ever submitted to Apostles for their revision and sanction, is a

proposition which no enlightened scholar would venture to affirm. We find that Luke, in the prologue of the Gospel, does not assume to write, as Councils of the Church have sometimes done, *Sancto Spiritu dictante;* but he invites confidence on the ground of his means of getting knowledge, and his diligent investigations. Some of the evangelical historians, Luke certainly, make use of prior documents, written memoranda from other sources. The Apostles themselves claimed credence for the story which they told, because they were telling what they had seen and heard. The number of the twelve, after the defection of Judas, was filled up by the choice of Matthias, that another witness, a companion of Christ, who had heard His teaching, and seen His works, might be provided (Acts i. 21, 22). We find that the Apostles limit their testimony to the period of their personal acquaintance with Christ; the first thirty years of His life—with the exception of a few incidents relating to His infancy and boyhood which were gathered up from oral sources—being passed over in silence. The laws that determine the credibility of history are respected in the composition of the sacred books. Contemporary evidence is furnished; and the departures from this practice are the exceptions that prove the rule.

The effect of the Harmonistic assumption, when applied in the concrete, is to lead to a mechanical combination of two or more relations, where a sound historical criticism would make a choice among diverse, and commonly unimportant, particulars, or rectify in such points the statement of one Evangelist by the apparently fuller information of another. Thus in the accounts of the denial of Peter, there is not a precise accordance as to localities. With regard to the second denial, Mark says that the same maid (ἡ παιδίσκη) put the question to which he responded; Matthew says, "another maid;" while Luke makes it "another man"

(ἕτερος—sc. ἄνθρωπος, ver. 58). This is a trifling divergence. It is a case where a narrator might not wish to be held responsible for a strictly accurate statement. But the older Harmonists, who conceived that the Evangelists must have written with the precision of a notary public, felt it necessary to avoid these variations by assuming that Peter's denials reached the number of nine or ten; although as to the main fact that they were three in number—by which it is meant that there were no more, as well as no less than three—the Evangelists are united; and such was unquestionably the real number. Out of a dread to admit the slightest inaccuracies in the Gospels, the Harmonists convert the evangelical history into a grotesque piece of mosaic.

It may serve to illustrate both the mistaken, and the true, method of historical criticism as applied to the Gospels, if attention is called to a few passages where two or more of the Evangelists are compared with each other. Look, first, at the Sermon on the Mount. We pass by questions as to its chronological place. Luke makes it to have been delivered after Christ descended from the Mount to the plain, with His disciples. On this point, a reconciliation, if one seeks it, is not impossible; yet the question arises at once whether Luke does not follow a different tradition from that which is presented in Matthew. We omit, also, the question whether all that Matthew connects with the Sermon on the Mount—for example, the Lord's Prayer—was uttered at that time, or whether utterances of Christ on other occasions are brought together by Matthew, as we might, perhaps, be led to infer from an inspection of parallel passages which occur in other connections in Luke.[1] We call attention to the beginning of the discourse, which the two Evangelists present in common.

[1] See above, p. 376.

Matthew writes: "Blessed are the poor in spirit," and, "blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness." Luke writes: "Blessed be ye poor;" "Blessed are ye that hunger now;" and, as a counterpart, "Woe unto you that are rich, for ye have received your consolation." The following are the parallel passages, placed in juxtaposition :—

Matt. v. 2–4.	Luke vi. 20, 21, 24, 25.
2 And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying,	20 And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed *be ye* poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.
3 Blessed *are* the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.	21 Blessed *are ye* that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed *are ye* that weep now: for ye shall laugh.
4 Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.	24 But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation.
	25 Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep.

Now as Christ on that occasion said one or the other, either "Blessed are the poor in spirit," or "Blessed be ye poor," and did not say both, we are driven to the inquiry, which is the more exact report? Did Luke abridge, or did Matthew amplify? Critics may differ in opinion on this question, and the full discussion of it would lead us too far. Our own opinion is that the statements in Luke correspond most nearly to those actually uttered. The poor were gathered about Jesus; their temporal condition—the hard circumstances of life—awakened in them humility and spiritual longing. For the reason, partly, that they were poor in purse they were poor in spirit. Christ said,

"blessed be ye poor," the implied condition being that spiritual poverty, which was shown by the way in which they flocked after Him, while the rich stood aloof, was the concomitant. Matthew's addition is explanatory. It guards against a misunderstanding.

Connected with the Sermon on the Mount is the account of the healing of the Centurion's son :—

MATT. VIII. 5–13.

5 And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, beseeching him,

6 And saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy and grievously tormented.

7 And Jesus said unto him, I will come and heal him.

8 The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed.

9 For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this *man*, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth *it*.

10 When Jesus heard *it*, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

11 And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven:

12 But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer

LUKE VII. 1–10.

1 Now when he had ended all his sayings in the audience of the people, he entered into Capernaum.

2 And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die.

3 And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto him the elders of the Jews, beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant.

4 And when they came to Jesus, they besought him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom he should do this:

5 For he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.

6 Then Jesus went with them. And when he was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to him, saying unto him, Lord, trouble not thyself; for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof:

7 Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed.

8 For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he

darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

13 And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, *so* be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the self-same hour.

cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth *it*.

9 When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him, and turned him about, and said unto the people that followed him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

10 And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick.

In Matthew, the Centurion comes himself to Christ, and presents his entreaty in person. In Luke, it is the elders of the Jews who are deputed on this errand; and Luke reports no interview at all between the Centurion himself and the Saviour. Here it may be considered probable that the first Evangelist abridges the tale by the omission of incidents that were familiar to him. But the suggestion must occur to the historical student that possibly two separate traditions, differing from one another in the circumstance of the deputation of the elders, appear in the several narratives.

Turn to a later part of the evangelical history. Each of the first three Evangelists narrates a miracle of Jesus at a gate of Jericho:—

MATT. XX. 29–34.

29 And as they departed from Jericho, a great multitude followed him.

30 And, behold, two blind men sitting by the way-side, when they heard that Jesus passed by, cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou* Son of David.

31 And the multitude

LUKE XVIII. 35–43; XIX. 1.

35 And it came to pass, that as he was come nigh unto Jericho, a certain blind man sat by the way side begging:

36 And hearing the multitude pass by, he asked what it meant.

37 And they told him, that Jesus of Nazareth passeth by.

MARK X. 46–52.

46 And they came to Jericho: and as he went out of Jericho with his disciples, and a great number of people, blind Bartimeus, the son of Timeus, sat by the highway side, begging.

47 And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus,

rebuked them, because they should hold their peace: but they cried the more, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, *thou* Son of David.

32 And Jesus stood still, and called them, and said, What will ye that I shall do unto you?

33 They say unto him, Lord, that our eyes may be opened.

34 So Jesus had compassion *on them*, and touched their eyes: and immediately their eyes received sight, and they followed him.

38 And he cried, saying, Jesus *thou* Son of David, have mercy on me.

39 And they which went before rebuked him, that he should hold his peace; but he cried so much the more, *Thou* Son of David, have mercy on me.

40 And Jesus stood, and commanded him to be brought unto him: and when he was come near, he asked him,

41 Saying, What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee? And he said, Lord, that I may receive my sight.

42 And Jesus said unto him, Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee.

43 And immediately he received his sight, and followed him, glorifying God: and all the people, when they saw *it*, gave praise unto God.

44 And *Jesus* entered and passed through Jericho.

thou Son of David, have mercy on me.

48 And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, *Thou* Son of David, have mercy on me.

49 And Jesus stood still, and commanded him to be called. And they call the blind man, saying unto him, Be of good comfort, rise; he calleth thee.

50 And he, casting away his garment, rose, and came to Jesus.

51 And Jesus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight.

52 And Jesus said unto him, Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole. And immediately he received his sight, and followed Jesus in the way.

Matthew speaks of two blind men; Mark and Luke of one. It is quite possible that there were two, though the conversation of Jesus may have been with only one of them. But Matthew and Mark say distinctly that it was when Christ was leaving the city, while Luke says that it was when He drew nigh to the city. Here the Harmo-

nists have supposed that Luke refers to a different miracle, performed earlier than that recorded by Matthew and Mark. But as the conversation reported by all the writers is substantially the same, and is peculiar, and neither notices more than one event of this kind at Jericho, that method of reconciliation is commonly abandoned. Another hypothesis is that Luke, in the word translated, "drew near," means "*was near*,"—that is, near, but on his way out. The Greek word (ἐγγίζειν) is not absolutely incapable of such a rendering, though this meaning would be quite unexpected. But when we read in Luke, immediately after the account of the miracle:—"And Jesus entered and passed through Jericho," with which is coupled the statement of his conversation with Zaccheus, the critical feeling of a scholar repels this method of harmonizing as forced and unnatural; and it requires a great strength of dogmatic bias to withhold one from the conviction that here is a real, though not important, divergence. Blind men, and mendicants of all sorts, took their station at the gates of cities. In the tradition which came to Luke, the miracle was placed at the gate by which Jesus entered; in the tradition which appears in the other Evangelists, it was the gate by which he left. The discrepancy shows that there was no collusion between the evangelical historians. It confirms, rather than weakens, the evidences of Christianity.

Many other diversities, most of them of minor consequence, present themselves on a close scrutiny of the Gospel histories. We have space for but one. The first three Gospels have always been understood, and are almost universally understood at present, to place the Last Supper on the evening when the Jews ate their passover. It is, also, the opinion of the great majority of exegetical scholars—including Neander, Bleek, Ewald, Meyer, Pressensé, Ellicott, Wescott, Farrar—that John places the Last Supper

on the evening of the day preceding the legal Passover, and the crucifixion on the morning when the Jews slew the lamb for this festival. If these positions are correct, there is a discrepancy in the chronology of the Evangelists here. Dr. Farrar states his conclusion thus: "To sum up, then, it seems to me, from careful and repeated study of much that has been written on this subject by many of the best and most thoughtful writers, that Jesus ate His Last Supper with the disciples on the evening of Thursday, Nisan 13, *i. e.*, at the time when, according to Jewish reckoning, the 14th of Nisan began; that this supper was not, and was not intended to be, the actual Paschal meal, which neither was, nor could be legally, eaten until the following evening; but by a perfectly natural identification, and one which would have been regarded as unimportant, the Last Supper, *which was a quasi-Passover*, and one in which, as in its antetype, memories of joy and sorrow were strangely blended, got to be identified, even in the memory of the Synoptists, with the Jewish Passover, and that St. John, silently but deliberately, corrected this erroneous impression, which, even in his time, had come to be generally prevalent."[1]

Whatever may be thought of the correctness of the opinion expressed in this passage, it shows how the principles of criticism which, for some time, have been almost unanimously accepted by scholars of the conservative schools on the continent, are making their way among orthodox divines in England. Richard Baxter, in his day, complained of those who assert that the Bible presents no signs of human imperfection, stake the truth of the Christian religion upon the correctness of "every item of history, genealogy, number, or word," and assert that every one who doubts whether a single word is true, or was dic-

[1] Life of Christ, ii. 482.

tated by the Holy Spirit, may, with equal reason, doubt the whole Gospel.[1] "And here," says Baxter, "I must tell you a great and needful truth, which ignorant Christians, fearing to confess, by overdoing tempt men to infidelity. The Scripture is like a man's body, where some parts are for the preservation of the rest, and may be maimed without death. The sense is the soul of Scripture, and the letters but the body, or vehicle."[2] Now, as always, it is essential to remember that the letter killeth. Concessions which the progress of Biblical criticism renders imperative, deprive infidelity of its most available weapon of attack upon the general credibility of the Gospel history.

In the critical study of the New Testament histories, the fact must be considered that the matter contained therein existed for a time as an oral tradition before it was committed to writing. It is, therefore, a legitimate and unavoidable inquiry whether it underwent changes to which narratives of events, and reports of conversations and discourses are, under such circumstances, liable. The main point is whether the productive element was active in the minds of those who orally repeated this historical matter, in modifying it, especially through the incorporation with it of elements unconsciously supplied by the imagination. The assumption of such an agency of the mythopœic imagination, has been used, as is well known, to cast a general discredit upon the Gospel histories.

Against this assumption lies the known fact that the teaching of the Rabbis was accurately rehearsed and transmitted by their pupils. To attribute to the disciples of Jesus a like retentiveness of memory respecting words and acts by which they were so deeply impressed, is therefore not without a precedent, and a warrant in the habit of their countrymen at the time. So strong and so definite was the

[1] Meth. Theol., III. c. 15, pp. 200, 201. [2] Pract. Works, xx. 429.

impression which Jesus made upon them that it is not too much to affirm respecting His actions and utterances generally, that they would be indelibly stamped upon the recollection of the witnesses. The identical words that He used, must, in many cases, have been imprinted upon the memory.

Moreover, the early date of the Synoptical Gospels—which, besides, were not the first essays at recording the evangelical history—precludes the assumption to which we refer. The choice of the Apostles and their superintendence of the churches were not without a purpose and an effect. And before the Apostles passed off the stage, the testimony which they were in the habit of giving, was embodied in written Gospels. A question may arise, here and there, respecting a particular incident, or turn of expression, on which critical scholars, not wanting in candor or in faith in the miraculous element of Christianity, may entertain a doubt. The narratives relating to the first thirty years of Jesus, not falling within the compass of Apostolic testimony as defined by Peter (Acts i. 22), are to be judged upon considerations peculiar to themselves. But the wholesale rejection of these narratives on this account is contrary to the sound principles of historical criticism. If here was ground on which the imagination would be tempted to dwell, it furnished also a stimulus to a sober curiosity on the part of Christians of the first generation, to ascertain facts respecting Jesus prior to His public ministry;[1] and such a curiosity might lead to inquiry among those who were personally cognizant of this portion of His life.

The Gospels do not pretend to the character of elaborate, or artistic biographies. They are—especially the first two—from men unpracticed in literary composition. They fail

[1] See below, p. 420 seq.

to furnish with strictness the chronological order of events. They have a certain fragmentary aspect, as opposed to complete and rounded memoirs. Anecdotes are linked together with no close bond of connection. Sayings of Jesus are set down, when much that He may have said in connection with them is left unrecorded. And yet, as presenting an authentic and a vivid portraiture of the Person who is the subject of these histories, it is probable that compositions of a more formal character could not possibly have equalled them. The Authors are lost in the subject; they attempt no studied delineation of Jesus, but allow Him to stand in the foreground, and to speak and act for Himself. There is a series of sketches, faithful to the reality, linked one to another with little outlay of art, yet so that together they exhibit the perfect character and life in a shape apprehensible to the imagination. No one who reads the Gospels need be at a loss to conceive of the manner in which Jesus lived from day to day, of the labors of mercy which He performed, or of the mode and substance of His teachings.

CHAPTER XIII.

JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE BEGINNING OF THE MINISTRY OF JESUS.

WHATEVER difficulties may arise respecting details here and there in the Gospel narrative, the strongly marked portraits of John the Baptist and of Jesus, each so distinct and in so striking contrast with the other, prove the essential verity, to say the least, of the historical records from which our conception of both is derived.

The Messianic expectation was too deeply imbedded in the structure of the Old Testament religion ever to be extirpated. The hopes of the people might at one time be directed predominantly to the general characteristics of the Messianic time, while the thought of the Person through whom the great work of renovation and victory was to be accomplished, might retreat into the background. Yet the conception of the Messiah in His personal character never died out, and, under favoring conditions, burst forth into fresh life. But the more exalted and holy this personage was conceived to be, and the more vivid was the sense of moral degeneracy and corruption in the minds of devout Israelites, the deeper was the conviction that a preparatory work must precede His appearance, and that a Prophet must arise to effect a reform, and pave the way for the Messiah's coming. In no other way could impending judgments, which only waited to be executed until the hour of the Messiah's advent, be averted. The expectation of a

forerunner associated itself with the Prophet Elijah. That, although he had gone from the earth, he still lived, and might reappear, either to thunder forth warnings and rebukes such as he had uttered to the apostate king Ahab and the devotees of Baal, or to rekindle the spirit of loyalty to God in the rebellious nation, became a common belief. The closing words of the Old Testament, from the pen of Malachi, were a prediction, which many construed in a literal sense, that Elijah was to be sent "before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."[1]

The voice of the last prophet had long been silent, but many souls were longing for the Deliverer to arise, when, "in the wilderness of Judea," the wild and thinly settled region lying to the westward of the Dead Sea, a Preacher appeared, who in his garb, and tone, and manner of life, as well as in his utterances, called to mind the austere Prophet of Gilead and Mount Carmel. His clothing was a rough cloak, or mantle, of camel's hair, thrown over the shoulders, and a belt of skin worn about his loins; his hair was shaggy and unshorn; his food was of the simplest sort, consisting of locusts and the juice that fell from the tamarisks, or, perhaps, the honey furnished by the wild bees of that sombre and desolate region, where, like monks of later ages, he had taken up his abode. No doubt the disciples, who were more or less closely attached to him, followed his example as well as precept, when they fasted often.[2] The "city of Judah," where John was born is thought by some to be Jutta, but was not improbably Hebron, the city where was the sepulchre of Abraham, the city which was assigned to the Levites, and in which David commenced to reign. He was of priestly descent, belonging to one of the four and twenty families who ministered in regular order in the temple, the son of parents

[1] Mal. iv. 5. 6. [2] Luke v. 33, Mark ii. 18.

who had consecrated him, according to the rule prescribed for Nazarites,[1] to a life of abstemiousness and devotion. How long he had lived as a hermit before he began to collect disciples around him, and to make his voice ring in the ears of the multitude, we have no means of determining. His honesty, fearlessness, and humility are his most conspicuous traits. Here was not one clad "in soft clothing" who had been brought up in kings' houses.[2] Here "was no reed, shaken by the winds;"[3] but an inspired soul, liberated from all dread of man, elevated above the influence of selfish passion, and himself schooled to practice the virtues which he demanded of others. Josephus, in the notice which he gives of him, agrees with the Gospel history in lauding his goodness.[4]

John can be identified with no previously existing sect. He differed from the Essenes in his outward garb, and in requiring but one baptism, while frequent lustrations were a prominent part of the Essenian cultus. Still more at variance was he with this sect in the spirit of his teaching, where mystical contemplation finds no place, and in the active and aggressive character of his whole work. Besides the Essenes, it is probable that, in that corrupt and troubled time, individuals, disconnected from any sect, withdrew from society and took up their abode in these barren and secluded places. Josephus relates that he lived for three years with one of this class named Banus, who dwelt in the desert, and used no other clothing than grew upon trees, and had no other food than the products that grew wild, and bathed frequently in cold water. This recluse Josephus expressly distinguishes from the Essenes and the other sects.[5] In John there is no trace of any doctrine or observance not in harmony with the principles of the Old

[1] Luke i. 15. [2] Matt. xi. 8, Luke vii. 25.
[3] Matt. xi. 7, Luke vii. 24. [4] Antiq., xviii. v. 2. [5] Vita, § 2.

Testament religion, and the observances of the Mosaic law.

In his preaching there were two prime elements. "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," was the sum of his discourse. Repentance must be thorough,—no mere ceremonial purification; but such an abandonment of sin as the Prophet Isaiah had demanded.[1] Every man, and every class of men, were to cease from the sin peculiar to themselves. The soldier was to abstain from violence; the tax-gatherer from extortion; and every one was generously to help his neighbor. Seeing in the crowd before him those who belonged to the ruling class, Pharisees who prided themselves on their sanctity, and, according to Matthew, Sadducees also, he addressed them as a brood of vipers, and demanded to know who had warned them to flee from the wrath to come. Hopes founded merely on Hebrew descent were worthless. God out of these stones—from the heathen, despised as they were—could raise up children to Abraham.[2] The second element in the Baptist's preaching, the grand motive to repentance, was the nearness of the kingdom. The hour of division and of separation was at hand! The axe was to be laid to the root of the tree! Every unworthy member of the community of God was to be cut off. The Messiah was to separate the chaff from the wheat, and to burn up the chaff with inextinguishable fire! The baptism of water was to be followed with baptism in the Holy Ghost, and in fire; for the penitent, in the Holy Ghost, purifying and imparting a new principle of moral life; and, for those who were evil, immersion in fire.[3] Thus Him who was to come after, John described as mightier than himself, as One for whom he felt himself unworthy to perform the most menial office.[4]

[1] Is. i. 16–18.
[2] Luke iii. 7. Cf. Matt. iii. 7.
[3] Matt. iii. 11. See Meyer, *in loco.*
[4] Matt. iii. 11.

Baptism was something not unfamiliar to the Jews. The proselytes from the heathen were baptized. Every synagogue was built, if possible, near a stream of water. Bathing, as a religious act, as we have said, was one of the noteworthy practices of the Essenes. The baptism of John was an act symbolical of repentance; an initiation, too, into the company of those who were to be in readiness for the manifestation of the Messiah.

Independently of the Gospels, Josephus is a witness to the profound impression made by the Prophet of the wilderness.[1] Crowds journeyed to hear him, and to be baptized in the sacred waters of the Jordan. The excitement spread over Judea, and the region east of the river, and extended even into Galilee. But John was not tempted by this popularity to entertain any higher idea of his own function. To the questions of a deputation of Priests, with Levites for their coadjutors, who were sent to him by the Sanhedrim, he replied that he was not the Christ, was not Elijah, not the Prophet predicted in Deuteronomy, who was not uniformly identified with the Messiah, but that he was the Voice of one crying in the wilderness, and summoning the people to prepare for the Lord.[2] His whole end and aim was to do the work of the herald whom Isaiah had foretold.

We have now to consider the direct connection of Jesus with John. Of the early life of Jesus we have no information except what is drawn from the introductory portions of Matthew and Luke. Mark, the earliest of the Evangelists, begins with the public ministry of Jesus; and the same is true of John, the latest, who aims to set forth the historical facts of which he had been a witness, and on which his own faith rested. It is evident that the accounts of the birth and childhood of Jesus which are presented by Matthew and Luke respectively, were derived from differ-

[1] Antiq., xviii. 5., 2. [2] John i. 19 seq.

ent sources. This lends support to their credibility, at least on the points where they are in agreement with one another. It is not improbable that Mary herself was the ultimate source of these traditions. After the Ascension of Jesus she resided at Jerusalem. Twice Luke refers to the mother of Jesus in a way to countenance the supposition that his accounts had been derived, directly or indirectly, from her: "Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart;" "but His mother kept all these sayings in her heart."[1] Circumstances which, if known to others, might be effaced from memory by the long years in which Jesus dwelt in the household, giving no visible sign of His Messianic calling, were indelibly imprinted upon her mind. The incredulity of the rest of His family when He began His ministry, and the faith of His mother, as evinced at the wedding of Cana, when she prompted Him to reveal his power, are thus equally explained.[2] The supposition that the narratives of the miraculous birth and of the infancy are nothing but the early Christian poesy with which the imagination, under the influence of the ministry, miracles, and resurrection of Jesus, invested the beginning of His life, is exposed to grave difficulties. The accounts in Luke unquestionably formed a part of his Gospel from its first composition, and were drawn from a written, and that a Jewish-Christian, source; as the Hebrew diction which is still left upon them attests. The accounts in Matthew are likewise homogeneous with the rest of the book, and not a later addition. The narratives of the miraculous conception, which are found in both Luke and Matthew, the visit of the Magi, the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, and the flight into Egypt, which are found exclusively in Matthew; the sublime and beautiful incident relative to the shepherds, and the other prior cir-

[1] Luke ii. 19, 51. [2] John ii. 3, 5.

cumstances which are peculiar to Luke, contain, as to their substance, nothing in itself incredible to one who admits the supernatural in the mission and life of Jesus. And without this admission, they would be inexplicable, regarded as unconscious poesy. Considered from the historical point of view, these various incidents, however, rest upon a different ground from the narrations of which the Apostles were direct witnesses; but this fact constitutes no valid ground for the sweeping criticism which rejects all this introductory portion of the Gospel history.[1] The chronological difficulties, and other difficulties of that sort, are no greater than generally belong to a collection of historical anecdotes, however authentic; especially where each of two or more writers introduces certain circumstances not known to the others.[2] The flight into Egypt may have taken place after the presentation of Jesus in the temple. Of the circumstances that led to the flight, it may be here observed that they are not at all incongruous with the savage deeds of Herod in his last days. In his last illness, he shut up the principal men of all Judea in the hippodrome at Jericho, and ordered Salome, his sister, at the moment of his decease to have them slaughtered by the soldiers, that there might be wailing after his death.[3] The silence of Josephus respecting the massacre at Bethlehem is not more remarkable than his deliberate silence respecting everything concerning Jesus; for the brief passage alluding to Him is much interpolated, if not wholly spurious.[4] With respect to whatever relates to the Messianic ideas of

[1] See the reasoning of Neander upon the improbability that the story of the miraculous conception could arise as a myth among the Jews, and upon the intrinsic probability of the other introductory narratives in Matthew and Luke. *Leben Jesu*, pp. 14–53.

[2] See above, p. 400.

[3] Josephus, *Antiq.*, xvii. 6, 5.

[4] Antiq., xviii. 3, 3.

the Jews, Josephus, out of regard to Roman jealousies and prejudices, practices the most discreet reserve.

Both the genealogies, it is now generally allowed, are of Joseph, his reputed father. The descent of Jesus from David was never questioned, as it would have been if there had been any ground for doubt on the point. The descent of Mary, likewise, from David, if not explicitly attested, is not excluded by anything stated in the Gospels. Both Evangelists unite in the statement that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, in Judea.[1] There is nothing in Matthew to imply a knowledge on his part that Bethlehem was only a place of temporary sojourn for His parents. It is represented that they chose Nazareth for a residence to escape from the tyranny of Archelaus.[2] Luke is more full here. The difficulty arising from the association with a taxing at that time, is not yet cleared up;[3] but, apart from this chronological point, the main fact of a visit

[1] Christ was born four years before our present era. Herod died either A. U. C. 750 or 751. But the beginning of our era is synchronous with A. U. C. 754. If, as is probable, Luke (iii. 23) regards the 15th year of Tiberius, as A. U. C. 780, when Tiberius became joint Emperor with Augustus, this would give A. U. C. 750 as the date of his birth, since at the time designated by Luke he was about 30 years old.

[2] Matt. ii. 22.

[3] Josephus states that Quirinus (Cyrenius) became Governor of Syria A. D. 6, and that the taxing under him took place immediately (A. D. 7). See *Antiq.* xvii. 13, 5; xviii. 1, 1; xviii. 2. The Governor of Syria in the last days of Herod, and the Governor who suppressed the insurrection immediately after his death, was Quintilius Varus (Jos., *Antiq.*, xvii. 5, 2; 9, 3; 10, 9; 11, 1). It has been made probable that Quirinus was twice governor of Syria. For the evidence, see Schürer, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*, p. 161. Upon the whole subject (including a consideration of Zumpt's theory that Quirinus, in his *first* governorship completed a census which Varus had begun), see Meyer, *Komm. uber das Evang. Lucas.* (Luke ii. 1), and especially Schürer, pp. 262-286. For the relation of the question to the credibility of Luke, see Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 32 n., Farrar, *Life of Christ*, i. 7, n. 2. For an examination of Zumpt's theory, see Dr. Woolsey, *Bib. Dict.*, Art., *Cyrenius.*

of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, in connection with a general taxation, or enrollment, stands intact. It is not impossible that they intended to transplant their abode to Bethlehem, but were prevented from doing so by the fear excited by Herod and by Archelaus. On some such hypothesis, the statements of the two Evangelists might be reconciled. But, not to dwell on these minor circumstances, it is certain that the parents of Jesus came back to Nazareth; He was known as a Nazarene. Four of his brothers, born, there is no sufficient reason to doubt, after this date, are mentioned by name,—James, Joses, Simon and Judas, of whom James and Judas, after the Ascension, became leading Disciples; and there were, also, several sisters, married, we may infer, at Nazareth, since it is not stated that they accompanied the rest of the family on their removal to Capernaum.[1] In this humble household, "subject to His parents," Jesus "increased in wisdom and

[1] Matt. xiii. 55. There were two Disciples in the number of the Twelve, who bore the name of James, viz., James, the son of Zebedee, and brother of John, and James the son of Alpheus. Was James, the "brother of the Lord," who was a sort of presiding elder, or bishop, in the Church at Jerusalem, identical with James the son of Alpheus? Some have answered in the affirmative, believing that the term "brother" in the designation of James as "brother of the Lord," signifies cousin. According to this view, the "brethren" of Jesus were children neither of Joseph or Mary. This was the opinion of Jerome; but it rests on no solid foundation. Epiphanius advanced an opinion, in which he was followed by many of the Fathers, that the "brethren" of Jesus were children of Joseph by a former marriage. If this were so, it would be difficult to explain the language of the Evangelists (Matt. i. 25; Luke ii. 7), in which Jesus is called the "first-born son" of Mary. This more naturally implies that she afterwards became the mother of other children. (See Meyer, and Bleek's *Synopt. Erkl. d. drei erst. Evangg.*, in loco). Prof. Lightfoot, who favors the theory of Epiphanius (*Galatians*, p. 264), finds a decisive argument in favor of it in John xix. 26, 27. John took Mary to his own home. "Is it conceivable," it is asked, "that our Lord would thus have snapped the most sacred ties of natural affection?" In

stature, and in favor with God and man."[1] "And the child grew," Luke also says, and "waxed strong"—"in spirit" are words interpolated in the text—"filled with wisdom, and the grace of God was upon Him."[2] Both passages refer to the physical as well as mental and moral development of the child Jesus. In illustration of the character of the child as thus described, Luke had obtained a knowledge of one deeply interesting incident, the tarrying of Jesus, then at the age of twelve, in the temple, where He was found absorbed in conversation with the doctors, and His explanation to His parents that He must be about His Father's business; or, as the expression should probably be understood, must be in His Father's house. There, He meant to say, was the place where they should naturally look for Him. The expression involves a deep sense, too deep for Him then to define in words, of His peculiar calling and relation to God.

But it is implied by Luke that these indications of an exceptional mental and religious quality, chiefly impressed his mother. There was nothing in the pure and blameless child, either then or as He grew up to manhood, assisting Joseph in his occupation as a carpenter,[3] to impress His brothers and sisters, or His townsmen, with the idea that He was destined for an exalted mission. This is shown by the way that His family regarded Him, after He had entered

answer to this, it may be said that, on the supposition that the "brethren" were children of Joseph, they had dwelt long in the family of Mary, and it might naturally have been expected that she would remain under the care of one of them. But it is quite conceivable that there may have been good reasons why she could not conveniently take up her abode with them, whether they were her natural offspring, or her children by marriage. The early sentiment in favor of the perpetual virginity of Mary deprives the sanction, which is given by the Fathers to the Epiphanian theory, of the weight which it might otherwise have.

[1] Luke ii. 51, 52. [2] Ver. 49. [3] Mark vi. 3.

upon His ministry, when they supposed Him to be out of His mind;[1] and by the incredulous exclamations of the inhabitants of the town when He appeared in their synagogue.[2] Nazareth lay in a green valley among the high hills of Galilee, not far below their topmost ridges. There, at a height of eight hundred feet above the level of the sea, inclosed in fifteen of those gently rounded hills which rise about it like the edge of a shell, was the secluded village where Jesus passed the first thirty years of His life.[3] From the heights above the town—"the brow of the hill on which the city was built—"[4] there spreads out one of the grandest views in all Palestine. The wide circuit which the eye traverses, includes on the south and southeast, the plain of Esdraelon, the theatre of so many battles; on the West, Mount Carmel and the Mediterranean; while to the East and to the North rise the dome-like top of Tabor, and the snowy summit of Hermon. In the midst of this scene, so rich in natural beauty, and in sacred associations of historic interest, under the quickening influence of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, in a household pervaded by the spirit of godly devotion, whose members yearly went up to the Passover, there was unfolded that mind "lofty beyond all human comparison, whose creative thoughts were to fertilize the spiritual life of man through all ages, and whose creative power sprang from its mysterious union with that Divine Word which gave birth to all things." No eminent character in history has owed less to external agencies. It is true that back of him lay the whole history of Israel, and that divine training which had stretched over a period of two thousand years. But in his immediate antecedents, when compared with the circumstances of others in his own nation,

[1] Mark iii. 21, John vii. 5. [2] Luke iv. 22. Cf. John vi. 42.
[3] See Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, pp. 357, 358. [4] Luke iv. 29.

there was nothing out of which pre-eminence could be predicted. Nazareth, apparently for some other reason besides its insignificance, was held in disesteem.[1] In the case of Jesus, the sources of wisdom and power were from within.

Among those who presented themselves to John for baptism was Jesus of Nazareth. The brief narratives of the Evangelists do not enable us to determine whether they had ever met one another before. If, as Luke relates, they were kinsmen, they had been widely separated, and John's manner of life would have hindered intercourse between them. The recognition of Jesus as the Messiah by John, has been called in question by certain modern critics.[2] If there was this recognition, it has been asked, why did not John himself join the company of the disciples of Jesus? Why did he not publicly proclaim Jesus as the Christ? How shall we explain it that John went on with his work; that his disciples were jealous of Jesus;[3] that, at a much later day, they existed as a separate body, not included among Christian believers? How shall we account for it that John himself, when he heard of what Jesus was doing, sent his disciples to inquire if he was in truth the Christ?[4] These questions deserve an answer. They present problems analogous to those which frequently arise in the field of history, where our information is scanty and fragmentary. A judicious criticism, in such cases, does not cut the knot which it should rather seek to untie. A capital fact to be kept in mind is that John stood at the point of transition between the old dispensation and the new. He belonged to the former; but foregleams from the coming day were cast back upon him. Glimpses, rather than

[1] See Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, Art., *Nazareth*.

[2] Hausrath, i. 320.

[3] John iii. 25, 26.

[4] Matt. xi. 3, Luke vii. 19.

a permanent vision, were granted him of the kingdom which it was his lofty function to usher in. The Evangelists unite in testifying that, in connection with the baptism of Jesus, John recognized Him as the Messiah for whom he was looking; that Jesus was manifested in this character by a supernatural sign—a dove-like appearance, symbolical of the Spirit—resting upon His head. The Evangelist who does not explicitly record the fact of the baptism of Jesus, but refers to it and implies it,[1] represents the Baptist as saying that he had not previously known Him, but that he knew Him through the sign by which it had been revealed to himself that the Messiah should be recognized. Upon the authority of this Evangelist, we may safely conclude that the sign in question was for the Baptist himself, to qualify him to give his testimony to Jesus. This does not preclude the conversation which preceded, when John expressed his unfitness to baptize one like Jesus, and Jesus overruled the objection on the ground that it behooved Him to fulfil all righteousness—everything in the divinely appointed order.[2] This conversation would imply, to be sure, a degree of knowledge of Jesus, a perception of His purity, and, it may be, of the exalted work in store for Him; but there was not that preappointed and absolute proof which empowered John to give solemn and public testimony. In this sense, he did not know Him prior to the sign from heaven. The essential truth of these narrations is established by an argument which is independent of the question of the credibility of the Evangelist.[3] The baptism of John was the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. It needs no argument to show that Jesus did not come, confessing sin, with stains of guilt to be washed away. He must have received baptism, un-

[1] John i. 32–34.
[2] Matt. iii. 14–16.
[3] Cf. Neander, *Leben Jesu* (5th ed.), pp. 88, 89.

der a different idea, and with another intent. There must have been a mutual understanding and a previous conference between him and John; and thus a strong anterior probability is attached to the Gospel narratives of this transaction.[1]

To the Baptist himself the baptism of Jesus was a full authentication of His Messianic calling: it was the introduction of the new kingdom. In reference to the people, it was a symbol of the repentance required for admission into it. With respect to Jesus Himself, it was an inauguration and consecration to His work. It did not signify that then for the first time He became aware of His vocation; for this was a conviction, there is every reason to conclude, that arose from within, and was due to no sudden outward occurrence. Nor did it signify that, up to that time, the Spirit was not with Him. But that was the hour when in His inward development He had reached the point of readiness for commencing His public ministry, and when, through the power of the Spirit, He was to be qualified for performing the miracles and other works belonging to this divine calling.

That John should characterize Him as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, as the Fourth Gospel records,[2] has been thought by some to be impossible at

[1] At that sublime moment in the history of mankind, when Jesus met John upon the banks of the Jordan, critics who never err on the side of credulity, feel constrained to admit something like a miracle. Keim says of this event:—"Auf diesen mitrathenden, thatenden entscheidenden Gott, der sie sendet, laufen alle ihre Reden, zumal die Reden Jesu zurück; unser historisches Gewissen zwingt uns zuzugestehen, dass sie aus diesem Bewusstsein gehandelt, und unser Denken sträubt sich nicht anzuerkennen, dass sie nicht aus irrendem Bewusstsein handelten, dass göttliche Veranstaltungen und Erleuchtungen am Jordan lagerten, und dass ein göttliches Wirken und Regieren die grösste That und die grösste Wendung der Menscheitsgeschichte begleiten musste." *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 549.

[2] John i. 36.

the point of view where John stood. But this passage from the Prophet Isaiah, where the Baptist found the inspired description of his own function and work, might occur to his mind, as a flash of light, on an occasion when he saw Jesus walking near, and marked, it may be, an aspect of gentleness in His mien and look. Such a perception might indicate a momentary illumination rather than a fixed conception.[1] The exclamation that God could raise up children to Abraham from the stones,[2] likewise surpassed the ordinary Jewish expectation.

It comported with the humble feeling of John and with his well-defined conception of the restricted nature of his own work, that he should leave the Messiah to establish His kingdom in His own time and way. He might point a few of his disciples, whose minds were inquisitive and susceptible, to Jesus; but, for himself, it belonged to him to go on with the labor appointed for him, of exciting the people to repentance, and of making ready for the new order of things, the precise nature of which would have been beyond his ken. For a while, the two Teachers taught contemporaneously, each laboring at the foundations of the kingdom in his own way. That disciples of John, more zealous for their master than he was for himself, should be disturbed when One whom he had baptized, was drawing after Him a portion of the multitude that had flocked after the Baptist in the wilderness, was not unnatural, nor contrary to experience. But how shall we explain John's own doubt, at a later day, after he had been thrown into prison?[3] This, too, was not unnatural. Events were not taking the shape which accorded with any anticipation that he had been able to form. Though a spiritual man, and insisting with all energy on righteous-

[1] See above, p. 356.

[2] Matt. iii. 9; Luke iii. 8.

[3] Matt. xi. 3, Luke vii. 19.

ness as the essence of the divine requirements, there is no reason to suppose that he was so much more enlightened than the disciples of Jesus, as to have risen altogether above the notion of an external theocracy. It is possible, yet it is gratuitous to suppose, that depression consequent on a suspension of his work and confinement in prison—where, however, his disciples had access to him—contributed to excite a temporary doubt in his mind. He was "not a reed shaken by the winds." Why then should we detract anything from his heroic constancy? The words of Jesus to those who were to report to John the miracles which they had seen—miracles which Isaiah had described as badges of the Messiah—were: "Blessed is he who is not offended (*μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ*) in me!" These words point clearly to the perplexity or disappointment which His failure to make a grand public demonstration of power might easily excite. Do they not suggest that the question of the Baptist had its origin in such a feeling?

After the record of the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan, there follows, in the first three Gospels, the account of the Temptation, when He spent "forty days"—whether to be taken literally, or as a round number, is uncertain—in the same wilderness of Judea where John first uttered his fiery appeals. In that mountainous, infertile, sparsely settled region, withdrawn from intercourse with men, Jesus girded Himself for the mighty task which lay before him—a task that involved a withstanding unto death of the solicitations that must arise on every side, so deep and universal was the demand for some sort of a temporal monarchy of which the Messiah should be the Head. The Synoptists, Mark, the oldest of them, included, all record the fact of the Temptation, and place it at the same point in the history. It is not such a fact as the imagination, in the absence of any historical basis for it, would naturally call into being.

Nor is the omission of it by John remarkable, when we consider the special end which dictates his selection of matter. In the chronology of John, it may find a place just before the account of the deputation sent from Jerusalem to interrogate the Baptist (i. 19).

When we pass beyond the Temptation, and investigate the early part of the Saviour's ministry, we find chronological data in the Synoptists, as compared with John, which do not admit of an easy adjustment. This grows out of the omission by the former of so great a part of the Judean ministry of Jesus. At the imprisonment of John, they tell us, Jesus went into Galilee, and entered upon His Galilean ministry.[1] They do not, however, say that the seizure of John followed at once upon the baptism of Jesus, nor, with the exception of the notice of the Temptation, do they state anything that occurred in the interval. John fills up the gap.[2] He tells us how two of the disciples of John the Baptist, of whom one was Andrew, and the other, as there is no room for doubt, was the Evangelist himself, saw the Baptist point to Jesus and describe Him as the Lamb of God.[3] He tells us, from his vivid recollection of that most important event of his life, that it was four o'clock in the afternoon, when he and Andrew followed Jesus to His lodging-place, and remained with Him through the day.[4] It was the next day after the Jewish deputies had conferred with the Baptist.[5] Andrew "first" found his brother Simon—the expression implies that John, too, was looking for his brother (James), but that Andrew succeeded first in finding the one of whom he was in quest. According to the Synoptists, also, Simon and Andrew, James and John, are the first, and the four most conspicuous, disciples. Their permanent attachment to Jesus in

[1] Matt. iv. 12, 17: "From that time," etc.
[2] See John iii. 24. [3] John i. 35–40. [4] Ver. 39. [5] Ver. 35.

this character, as we may reasonably believe, occurred later, according to the narrative of the Synoptists, when they laid down their occupation and followed Him. Thus it was from the circle of John the Baptist, as was quite natural, that the first nucleus was formed of that company which became the chosen companions of Jesus. At the outset, Jesus gave to Simon the name of Peter, the Rock,[1] for the quality which He discerned at a glance in this earnest and devoted leader of the band of His immediate followers. The passage in Matthew (xvi. 18), in which Jesus addresses Peter as the Rock, does not imply that on this last occasion he first received the appellation, but rather that his confession of faith was in keeping with the name which he already bore.[2] On the day following, Jesus set out for Galilee, and called into His company, another disciple, Philip, who was from Bethsaida, the home of Andrew and Peter.[3] Somewhere, as they were on the way, Philip found a friend, Nathanael, who is not improbably the Bartholomew with whom the name of Philip, in the list of Apostles, is generally linked. Nathanael, at first incredulous on hearing that Jesus was from Nazareth, a place from which he could expect nothing good to come, was impressed with the penetrating judgment which Jesus expressed concerning him, of the truth of which he might, without pride, be conscious; and still more by the remark of Jesus that he had seen him when he was under a fig-tree, where, it may be, he recollected that, according to an ancient custom, he had gone for meditation, and where his thoughts had been absorbed in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God. This evidence that Jesus knew what was in man, which had evoked faith in the mind of the honest Israelite, would be followed, Jesus assured him, with far more striking evidences of a direct relation,

[1] John i. 42. [2] See Meyer, *in loco*. [3] John i. 44.

on His part, to God, and of converse with the supernatural world.[1]

On the third day—the reckoning is probably from his departure for Galilee (i. 43)—we find Jesus, in company with His mother and His disciples, at a wedding in Cana. Here began the exertion of His miraculous power. The supply of wine gave out, and Mary, who was waiting for the manifestation of that power which, as she felt assured, dwelt in Him, reported to Him the fact in a way to suggest that here was the occasion to exert it.[2] His reply, though not harsh, as it may seem, involved the idea that the use of this power, like every other step which He should take in the prosecution of His work, was to be prompted from above, and not to be subject to human interference. The moment when, and the manner how, this manifestation of His "glory" should take place, it was left to the divine will to direct. In the nature and occasion of this miracle, how strong is the contrast exhibited between Jesus and the Forerunner, "who came neither eating nor drinking!"[3]

From Cana He went on, with His mother, brothers, and disciples, to Capernaum.[4] This flourishing town upon the borders of the Lake became the abode of His family, and the centre of His labors in Galilee. But on this occasion He remained there only a short time.[5] The occurrence of the Passover led Him to go up to Jerusalem. At this time it was that, impelled by zeal for the sanctity of the Temple, His Father's House, He drove the money-changers, and other traffickers, with the animals that were offered for sale, out of the Court of the Gentiles. His blended words

[1] John i. 51.

[2] This interpretation we adopt, against Meyer *in loco*. See Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 271.

[3] Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 33.

[4] John ii. 12.

[5] John ii. 12.

and acts, and the air of authority and righteous indignation that accompanied them, disarmed resistance. It was an appropriate beginning of His ministry at Jerusalem; a deed in keeping with the labors of the Baptist which had gone before, and the offspring of that prophetic ardor which broke forth as a flame, as we shall see, in His opening ministry in Galilee. During this visit to Jerusalem, occurred, also, the interview with Nicodemus, a member of the Sanhedrim, who was impressed by the miracles which Jesus had done, but not being fully decided in his own mind as to His Messianic claims, or not caring to incur the consequences of a public committal in His favor, came to him by night. The effect of the conversation is not stated; but Nicodemus appears twice afterward in the narrative of John, first as remonstrating against the condemnation of Jesus without a hearing of the cause (vii. 50), and again, after the crucifixion, in connection with Joseph of Arimathea, as an applicant for His body, for which he had brought a rich supply of "myrrh and aloes" (xix. 38).

After this sojourn in Jerusalem, Jesus and His Disciples are once more, for a while, in the neighborhood of John the Baptist and his company, who were at Ænon near Salim, which appears to have been within the bounds of Judea.[1] This gives the Evangelist occasion to mention a dispute between some of John's disciples and a Jew—the plural (Jews) is an erroneous reading—about baptism; probably, upon the comparative significance and value of the rite as performed by John and by Jesus. This rite was kept up by Jesus, and became a permanent institution in the Church; although, as the Evangelist takes care to inform us, it was the Disciples, and not Jesus Himself, the Head

[1] See John iv. 3. This passage does not favor the opinion that Ænon was near Scythopolis, as is held by Prof. Hackett (*Bible Dict.*, Am. ed., Art. *Ænon*), and others.

of the kingdom, who administered it.[1] The jealousy of certain disciples of the Baptist, failed to affect John himself, who compared himself to the friend of the Bridegroom, who rejoices to hear the Bridegroom's voice and to give place to him.[2]

The announcement that the Pharisees were informed of the increasing number of His disciples, moved Jesus to leave Judea and return to Galilee, where He would be farther removed from their machinations. On the way, at Sichem, occured the memorable interview with the Woman of Samaria; and, on the same journey, the visit of the "nobleman," a person in the civil or military service of Herod Antipas, whose son was sick at Capernaum. The miracle of healing, not to be confounded, it would seem, with the healing of the Centurion's son,[3] is said to be "the second miracle that Jesus did, when He was come out of Judea into Galilee;"[4] that is to say, it marked His second entrance into Galilee, as the miracle at Cana had marked His first.

John does not state when the Baptist was thrown into prison. He simply explains that up to a certain point in his narrative this event had not taken place. To identify either of the journeys into Galilee which John describes with that journey, which, according to the first three Evangelists, followed the confinement of John and preceded the Galilean ministry, leaves certain chronological difficulties unsolved. As concerns the opening pages of the Synoptists, we must be content with the vivid and truthful picture which they present of the early labors of Jesus in Capernaum and the adjacent region. It is impossible to fix with certainty the chronological place of so interesting an incident as the preaching of Jesus,

[1] John iv. 2. [2] John iii. 29. [3] Matt. viii. 5–14, Luke vii. 1–11.
[4] John iv. 54.

and His rejection, at Nazareth, which is set down by Luke at the very beginning of the Galilean ministry, but which is put elsewhere by Matthew and Mark.[1] Turning to Mark, we find a graphic account, such as the Evangelist might well have derived from Peter, of the powerful impression made by Jesus at the outset of His work in that region. It began with teaching, and with the calling of Disciples.[2] He preached the Good News of the Kingdom—that the period of time preceding had now run out; and He called upon the people to repent and to believe in this Gospel. The Evangelist gives us a sketch of a single day in His life.[3] On a Saturday—a Jewish Sabbath—He entered into a synagogue of Capernaum, and taught. No such teaching had been heard from the Scribes; He spoke from a living intuition of truth, which required no nice argumentation or appeals to tradition in support of it; He spoke "as one that had authority,"[4] and a profound impression was made by His words. In the synagogue was a demoniac; a lunatic with that dual consciousness, which sprang out of a real or supposed possession by an evil spirit. The outcries of this maniac were stilled at the command of Jesus. His shrieks and convulsions were immediately followed, to the amazement of the spectators, by a restoration to his right mind. Coming out of the synagogue, Jesus entered the house of Simon Peter, the mother of whose wife was confined to her bed with a fever. On being told of her illness, He went to her, and took her by the hand, when she rose up, cured of her disorder, and able to prepare the meal for the household. At sunset, when the Sabbath had closed, there was a great gathering at the door. Demoniacs, and persons afflicted with all sorts of disorders, were brought thither by their friends, that He

[1] Luke iv. 14–30, Matt. xiii. 53-58, Mark vi. 1-6.
[2] Mark i. 14 seq. [3] Mark i. 21 seq. [4] Mark i. 22.

might heal them. This work of mercy and power closed the day. On the following morning, long before the dawn, He rose from His bed, and went out of the town to a secluded place for prayer. There, at a later hour, Peter and his associates found Him. So, in all the towns of Galilee, as the Evangelists tell us, He taught, proclaiming the near presence of the Kingdom, and healing those afflicted with disease.[1]

A sketch of the beginning of the ministry of Jesus may properly close with a notice of the death of John the Baptist. When John crossed the Jordan, he came into the country of Herod Antipas, who, by the last change in the will of his father, Herod "the Great," was Tetrarch of Galilee and Perea. This Prince had the cruelty, the cunning, and the sensuality, but lacked the energetic virtues, of his father. While on a visit to Rome, he became enamored of Herodias, the wife of his half-brother, Herod Philip I. She was herself the daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Herod the Great, so that Herod Antipas, whom she deserted her husband to marry, was her step-uncle. To effect this adulterous and incestuous union, Herod Antipas was obliged to separate from his wife, who was a daughter of Aretas, the Emîr of Arabia, and who fled from his household to her father. His marriage with Herodias brought upon him the calamities of his reign. Aretas, indignant at the repudiation of his daughter—there was also a dispute concerning boundaries—made war upon him, and inflicted upon him a crushing defeat. At a later day, at the instigation of Herodias, he repaired to Rome to obtain from Caligula the title of king; but he was opposed by the agents of Herod Agrippa, was banished to Lugdunum, and ended his life in exile.

What was the ground of the arrest of John? Josephus

[1] Mark i. 39.

says that, seeing the crowds that flocked after him, Herod apprehended a rebellion, which a leader of so great influence could easily excite, and determined to forestall the danger by taking the life of the prophet.[1] The Evangelists attribute the seizure and death of John to his bold rebuke of Herod on account of his marriage to Herodias, and to her enmity. . These two grounds are quite consistent with each other. That John should condemn Herod, in his public discourses, and even privately to his face, was entirely in keeping with the character of the Prophet, with the denunciations that he uttered to the Pharisees, and with the Old Testament examples of the courage and faithfulness of such men as Samuel and Elijah, in dealing with iniquitous princes. Luke states that John rebuked Herod, not only for marrying his brother's wife, but also "for all the evils" which he had done.[2] This being the attitude of the Prophet, the fear of a rebellion on the side of Herod, and the mortal hatred of Herodias, might well co-exist, and conspire to effect the destruction of John. He was cast into the Castle of Machærus,[3] situated eastward from the Jordan, and at once a splendid palace and an impregnable fortification. Matthew says that Herod desired to put him to death, but feared that the popularity of the Prophet might lead to the avenging of his death.[4] Mark says that Herod "feared John," knowing that he was a just and holy man; that the King (as he was called by courtesy [5]) frequently had interviews with him, listened to him, and in many things followed the directions of John[6] so that when Salome, obeying the instruction of her mother, Herodias, demanded the Prophet's head, Herod was extremely sorry. But Matthew, also, says that Herod was sorry (ἐλυπήθη), when this bloody forfeit was exacted;[7] and Matthew states that

[1] Antiq. xviii. 5, 2. [2] Luke iii. 19. [3] Antiq. xviii. 5, 3.
[4] Matt. xiv. 5. [5] Mark vi. 25. [6] Mark vi. 20. [7] Matt. xiv. 9.

when the fame of Jesus and of His miracles in Galilee, reached the ears of the tyrant, he exclaimed: "this is John the Baptist; he is risen from the dead!"[1] Such an exclamation could spring only from a terrified conscience. That he had a divided mind with reference to the murder of John, is probable. Anger at the Prophet's rebuke of his crime, and dread of a popular rising, had urged him to the deed. At the same time, a secret homage for so holy a man, which he could not extinguish in his mind, and, in certain moods, a disposition to hear him, and to obey his counsels—a kind of fascination which the Prophet cast over him at moments when a sense of guilt was awakened—held him back from so dreadful a crime. The pledge to Herodias which, in the presence of all his guests at the festival, he was called upon to redeem, compelled him to a decision.

The disciples of John took up his corpse, which was, perhaps, thrown outside the wall of the fortress, and buried it; and "went and told Jesus."[2] Herod's attention was called to what Jesus was doing, apparently shortly after the murder of John, and while the twelve disciples of Jesus were on the mission upon which He had sent them.[3] On being informed of these circumstances by the Apostles on their return, Jesus who was on the Galilean side of the Lake, crossed to some retired place near Bethsaida, lying on the north-east of the Lake, in the dominion of another prince, the Tetrarch Philip. The grand figure of John the Baptist disappears from the history, eclipsed only by One immeasurably Greater, of whom John had said: "He must increase, but I must decrease!"[4]

[1] xiv. 2. [2] Matt. xiv. 12. [3] Luke ix. 1 seq. [4] John iii. 30.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE PLAN OF JESUS AND HIS MEANS OF ACCOMPLISHING IT.

It is clear that from the outset of His public ministry, Jesus presented Himself to His Disciples as the Christ—the predicted Messiah of the Old Testament. His reserve and caution in proclaiming Himself in this character are not difficult of explanation. They do not militate against the statement above made, but rather serve to confirm the truth of it. It has been pretended by some that, whatever may have been His own conviction on this point, the Apostles at least were not at first instructed as to the real nature of the office which He was to assume, but regarded Him as a prophet, with no defined view as to His particular function and rank. This theory is supposed to be sustained by a conversation of Jesus with the Disciples (Matt. xvi. 13 seq.) at a time when they had long been associated with Him. "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" The answer was that by some He was taken for John the Baptist, risen from the dead—which was also the conjecture of Herod Antipas, under the prompting of a frightened conscience: by others He was thought to be Elijah, who was expected to re-appear as the immediate precursor of the Messiah; by others still He was supposed to be Jeremiah, or some other great prophet, returning to the earth to discharge a similar office. Having heard their report of the opinions entertained by others, Jesus turns to them with the inquiry: "But whom say ye that I am?" In response to Peter's

exclamation: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," Jesus pronounced his confession of Faith, or him as making this confession, the rock on which the Church was to be built. It contained the substance of the Christian faith. This conversation is far from implying that Peter and his fellow-disciples now for the first time recognised their Master as the Christ, as if they had been previously ignorant or doubtful on this point. The same Evangelist who records it, affords full proof to the contrary. In the Sermon on the Mount, the date of which is fixed by the contemporaneous selection of the Disciples, Jesus presents Himself in the most unmistakable manner as the Messiah. In the conference with the messengers who had been sent by the Baptist, Jesus sends back to the prophet, who for the moment was wavering in his faith, an enumeration of the works done by Himself, all of them the well understood proofs and badges of the Messiah (Matt. xi. 4 seq.). The same Evangelist records (xi. 25 seq.) the thanksgiving of Jesus that not the wise and prudent, but the humble and ignorant, had been brought to discern the things of the Gospel; and this expression He accompanied by a declaration respecting his relation to the Father, such as a prophet lower than the Christ could never make: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." He was styled the Son of God by the demoniacs (Matt. viii. 29), and, on another occasion, by those who witnessed His miraculous power on the Sea of Galilee (Matt. xiv. 33).[1] At the very beginning, he was recognized in this character

[1] Among other passages in Matthew which distinctly involve a profession of Messiahship on the part of Jesus, see viii. 21, ix. 1–8, x. 32, xii. 1–9.

by John the Baptist, as the Synoptical Gospels imply; and through this testimony, according to the Evangelist John (i. 42, 46, 50), the first disciples were led to attach themselves to Him. The emphatic commendation of Peter, in the passage to which we have referred (Matt. xvi. 13 seq.), was not for the reason that he, for the first time, and in advance of the other Apostles, had discovered that Jesus was no other than the Christ. But it was the extraordinary circumstances under which Peter's faith was declared, and its peculiar character, which elicited the reply of Jesus. The people were hesitating and doubting on account of the disappointment of their expectations: Jesus showed no sign of appearing as a political champion. At this moment, Peter broke out in the most fervent profession of his faith. Moreover, it was a belief which "flesh and blood"—human testimony—had not evoked within him. It was the outpouring of an inner, irresistible conviction; it was a revelation from above. A believer when others were doubtful, speaking from an illumination of mind which God Himself had imparted, the ardent Apostle merited the distinction of being called the Rock. There is nothing in this incident which is inconsistent with what we know from other sources, that Jesus from the day of His baptism professed Himself to be the Messiah, and was owned as such by His followers.[1]

From His first public appearance, Jesus represented Himself as the founder and head of a kingdom. The "kingdom of God"—"the kingdom of heaven"—was what He came to establish. This claim and design pervade the Gospel narrative of His teachings. The inscription upon the cross—This is the King of the Jews—meant as a sarcasm, set forth the office which all knew that He

[1] That Jesus was assured of His Messiahship from the beginning of His ministry, is admitted and maintained by Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, i. 543.

claimed to fill. But the whole tenor of His life and of His declarations proved that this kingdom, or community, was to be bound together by a moral and spiritual bond of union. Its members were to be united by an inward affinity, and a common spirit of love to Him. It was to be a fraternity of souls. Another thing that is evident in His teaching is that the Gentiles were to belong to this kingdom. It was not for the posterity of Abraham alone. This is perfectly clear from much of the teaching of Christ, as recorded in Matthew, not to speak of the other Gospels.[1] That He first sent out the twelve "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel,"[2] and His reply to the Syrophœnician woman,[3] indicate only the limit set to His own personal labors in founding the kingdom. But even in this last place, His compliance with the earnest request of the woman, shows that this limit was no impassable barrier, but was only temporary,—a preliminary step towards the execution of a more comprehensive plan.[4] His interview with the woman of Samaria, and the incidents that followed, are a similar proof that it was a large expediency, and not a rigid or exclusive spirit, that confined His own labors mainly to the Jewish people.

But all this may be conceded, and yet it might be supposed that Jesus looked forward to the organization of this community in a political form. This idea has been seriously advocated by certain writers. They have supposed that Jesus may have anticipated such an acceptance of His authority on the part of the people as would lead, through a peaceful revolution, to His enthronement in the seat of David. And as to the inclusion of the Gentiles—that was a familiar feature of Old Testament prophecy, and

[1] See below, p. 470. [2] Matt. x. 6. [3] Matt. xv. 27, Mark vii. 28.

[4] Against the notion that the plan of Jesus had a "national-particularistische Beschränkung," see Baur, *N. T. Theologie*, p. 118 seq.

must have been expected in some form, even by those who conceived of the Messiah as a temporal prince. Bishop Butler, in an interesting passage of the Analogy, descanting upon the tendency of virtue to acquire power, imagines a kingdom or society of persons, perfectly virtuous, for a succession of ages. He depicts the inward unity and strength of such a community, and the advantages which it would possess, not only for repelling injuries, but for extending its sway through a moral influence. "It would plainly be superior to all others, and the world must gradually come under its empire: not by means of lawless violence, but partly by what must be allowed to be a just conquest; and partly by the kingdoms submitting themselves voluntarily to it, throughout a course of ages, and claiming its protection, one after another, in successive exigencies." [1] One who imputes to Jesus the limitations of knowledge and foresight that pertain to men generally, may conceive of Him, in the earlier stages of His career, as having indulged a noble but fallacious hope of this nature —a hope shattered and dissipated by the bitter experience of the world's hatred to righteousness. Were this a correct theory, we should be obliged to suppose that, having started with high and enthusiastic hopes of being the instrument of the moral and spiritual renovation of the Jewish nation, and of the wide extension of the kingdom, in accordance with the prophetic anticipations, He was brought finally to the necessity of abandoning these glowing expectations, and of giving to His undertaking another cast. Plausible as such a theory may sound, it will not stand the test of historical investigation. In the conception of Jesus that underlies it, there is overlooked that sobriety of His mental tone, and that knowledge of human nature, which saved Him at all times from illusive hopes, and enabled Him to

[1] Analogy, ch. iii.

forecast the future. An attentive examination of the Gospel history will show the falsity of the hypothesis which attributes to the founder of Christianity the design to establish a temporal kingdom of however exalted a type.

1. At the threshold of the narrative of the public life of Jesus stands the account of the Temptation. Whatever may be the proper interpretation of the passage, wherever the line may be drawn between the literal and the figurative in its contents, it is hardly reasonable to doubt, from its chronological position, that it describes inward experiences of Jesus at the crisis when He was about to enter upon His public work. It was the hour of preparation; the future lay before Him. What course should He pursue? How should He use the miraculous powers with which He was endowed? We have, in this narrative, the suggestions that passed through His mind, only to be instantly repelled. There are also reflected in this narrative the temptations that lay in His path through the whole course if His life. It is an epitome of those demands, solicitations, worldly hopes and aspirations, which it was His moral task to withstand, even though the consequence of His fidelity to a loftier ideal were the sacrifice of His life. Jesus was not exempt from that law of divine Providence in virtue of which extraordinary powers bring with them a proportionate moral trial. Shall they be used—these high and exceptional powers—for the end for which they are given, in subservience to the divine order; or shall they be wielded as a private instrument, for the furtherance of some personal end? Shall they, even if not thus perverted, be employed after a method not authorized by Him who bestowed them? If we follow the order in Matthew, which is marked by profound psychological verity, the first temptation was to use that extraordinary power over physical nature, of which Jesus found Himself possessed, for the gratification of His per-

sonal wants—the alternative being an unfaltering trust in God, who would see that these necessities were, in His own time and way, supplied. When this solicitation had been repelled, the appeal was artfully made to that very trust in God which had been His panoply against this first assault of evil. Being thus protected by God, why should He not demonstrate His privilege by flinging Himself needlessly into danger? Why not leap from the pinnacle of the temple? Shall this miraculous power be regarded as a sacred deposit, to be used only in conformity with the design for which it was imparted, or shall it be the medium of a dazzling spectacle—something akin to the arts of magic—a vain self-glorification? It is in the last of the temptations that the unworldly character of the kingdom which Jesus was aiming to establish, becomes manifest. A hasty outward success, a rapid progress of His cause through methods not accordant with the divine plan and will, and involving, under however fair a disguise, a compliance with a Satanic spirit of self-assertion and of opposition to God, was recommended to Him, and pressed upon Him from without, at every stage of His career. When Peter uttered his warm remonstrance against the idea that his Master was to suffer and be put to death, Jesus treated it as a suggestion of evil, an effort of the Tempter and Adversary to decoy Him out of the appointed path, and impel Him to a course, which though it might promise a speedy, imposing triumph, involved the surrender of His supreme allegiance to right and truth. Kindred suggestions emanating from friends, relatives, and loved disciples, or coming as taunts of His enemies, met Him at every turn. But He gave to them no shadow of countenance.

Jesus exhibited an entire independence of parties. His position was not determined by any feeling of opposi-

tion to any of them; He represented no reaction. Rather is it true that He stood on a higher plane, and was moved by considerations altogether distinct from any impulse to follow or to oppose prevailing tenets. This is remarkable especially as regards the Pharisees, to whom He conceded a certain authority as teachers of the law, and who from their number, and standing, and apparent sanctity, impressed the people with awe. Jesus discriminates between what is to be followed and what rejected in their creed and conduct. But nothing in the plan of His own career, or in the doctrine which He inculcated, is caught up from them. His path is marked out with entire independence, in a way to clash directly with the ideas of the most revered leaders. This is one of the most impressive evidences of the originality of Jesus. It was from within, and not from without that He derived that conception of His office and work, which, with undeviating constancy, He proceeded to realize.

2. On every occasion when he was invited to exercise functions which belong to a temporal kingship, he declined to do so, and disavowed the possession of the prerogatives which acts of this nature would involve. When asked whether it was lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar—a question proposed for the purpose of eliciting some profession of authority of a civil nature—he replied by directing that the coin which was paid in tribute should go to the person whose image it bore.[1] When asked to adjudicate a question of disputed inheritance, he disowned the functions of "a judge and divider." His mission was to eradicate covetousness.[2] He reminded Pilate that the fact that His disciples did not fight proved His kingdom not to be of this world.[3] How could a kingdom exist without the exertion of physi-

[1] Matt. xxii. 17, Mark xii. 14, Luke xx. 22.
[2] Luke xii. 13. [3] John xvii. 36.

cal power? When the enthusiastic people would make Him a king, He "departed into a mountain Himself alone."[1]

3. The nature of the regal office which Jesus assumed is clearly enough seen in His actual proceedings.

What was the character of His legislation? This appears in the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. They relate to tempers of heart as between man and man, and man and God, and to ethical conduct. They have nothing directly to do with civil relations and obligations. They are stripped of all sense and of all value, unless it is presupposed that the Lawgiver has in view, not the organization of a state, but the moral guidance of mankind. Nothing can be further from a scheme of civil polity than the injunctions of Jesus in this discourse and elsewhere.[2]

Who are to be the subjects of the new kingdom? They are those who become as little children.[3] They who purpose in their hearts to do the will of the Heavenly Father belong to the kingdom.[4] Such a parable as that of the Unforgiving Debtor[5] shows what the qualifications are of those who are enrolled as subjects of Christ.

The exertions of power which Christ put forth illustrate the character of His kingship. They were directed to the

[1] John vi. 15.

[2] Professor Holtzmann, who is not to be classed with conservative critics, forcibly sets forth the inconsistency of the Sermon on the Mount with the supposition of any illusion in its Author respecting the effect of His work: "Steht es aber so mit der Bergrede, so liefert schon sie Beweis genug hierfür, das Jesus von Anfang an ein Kreuzesreich vor Augen sah, und dass er sich nie der Illusion hingegeben hat, eine weltliche Reform oder auch nur einen allgemeinen religiös-sittlichen Umschwung im Volke Israel gleichsam wie mit einem Zauberstabe hervorrufen zu können. Eine Theokratie mitten im römischen Reich gründen zu wollen, wäre die Sache eines Schwärmenden gewesen." *Die Synopt. Evangg.*, pp. 481, 482.

[3] Matt. xviii. 3, xix. 14, Mark x. 14, Luke xviii. 16.

[4] Matt. vii. 21, xii. 50.

[5] Matt. xvii. 23–35.

extirpation of sin and of its consequences. He healed the sick, restored lunatics to the use of reason, asserted his dominion over Nature by subduing the tempest, and multiplying the loaves for the feeding of the hungry.[1]

The penalty of unfaithfulness to his commandments was expulsion from the fellowship and companionship of his followers. But the tares were to be left to grow with the wheat. The punishment of disobedience was to be inflicted, not through the verdict of any visible earthly tribunal, but by a Judgment which stands at the termination of the present order of things.

4. The character of the persons whom He brought into close connection with Himself, and made His special agents, is enough to show that He looked forward to no civil revolution by which a new form of government should be set up in the Jewish state. He described them Himself as "babes"[2]—men of childlike simplicity of character, strangers to all the arts and accomplishments requisite for the realization of political schemes. All but one of them were Galileans. Had Jesus aimed to effect His end, either through scientific thought, or worldly sagacity and power, He would have selected a very different class of instruments. And to suppose that He hoped to found a new civil community of an utterly exceptional character—resting solely on consent, and voluntary obedience to the behests of right—is to impute to Him an idea more visionary by far than ever entered the brain of a philosophic dreamer.

5. These erroneous judgments as to the plan of Jesus are precluded by observing the clearness with which He discerned the obstacles that stood in the way of the ac-

[1] On this topic there are fine remarks by Ewald, *Geschichte d. V. Israel*, v. 189.

[2] Matt. xi. 25, Luke x. 21.

ceptance of His claims and of His doctrine. There is no ground whatever for thinking that He ever for a moment expected an easy triumph and a universal rally to His cause. No delusion was possible on this point. From the first, He warned His followers that they must look for persecution.[1] From the rulers of Church and State, even from their own household, they must expect opposition carried to the pitch of bitter hatred.[2]

6. In connection with the mention of this perception, on His part, of the enmity which the band of His disciples would provoke upon themselves, observe the insight into the general effect of His teaching on different classes of men, which characterized Him. He knew what was in man. He understood the power of sin in human nature, and the resistance to be expected from this antagonistic principle. One who has derived from the study of the Gospels anything like an adequate sense of the profound moral discernment of Jesus will find it impossible to believe that He counted upon an easy victory, that He undervalued the depth of human blindness, and the strength of human selfishness. Rather is it true that He weighed this resisting force exactly. He directed His glance forward, and foresaw what would be the reception of the Gospel among the generations of men. Nothing can be farther removed from the temper of an enthusiast or a visionary, than the calm survey which He presents of the reception which will be accorded to His doctrine—for example, in the Parable of the Sower.[3] He who knew how, by a word, to probe the heart and bring out its hidden secret, or bring to the light its dominant passion, was not ignorant of the obstacles which must be overcome in order to give success to His mission.

[1] Matt. v. 11, 12, x. 16–22, 28. [2] Matt. x. 35, 36, Luke xiv. 26.
[3] Matt. xiii. 3 seq., Mark iv. 3 seq., Luke viii. 5 seq.

7. He anticipated, from the beginning, that His life would be the forfeit of His fidelity to the work that had been given Him to do. It was natural that He should not at the outset, but, rather, later and by degrees, convey to His disciples the knowledge of an event which ran counter to their pre-established ideas, and which it was hard for them to conceive of as possible. It was natural, too, that a more joyous tone should mingle in the first proclamation of the good tidings, before the gathering enmity of priest and scribe, with its deadly intent, had been developed. As the event drew near, the shadow which it cast before grew darker, the expectation of it more vivid, the prediction of it more distinct. But that Jesus looked forward to it as the only possible issue of the inevitable conflict which He waged with the ruling powers, admits of no reasonable doubt.

8. If any temporal or political elements, however sublimated in their character, had mingled in the conception which Jesus cherished of His kingship, the fact would have been manifest in the preaching and in the writings of the Apostles. They knew what was the character of the Master's teaching. They make it evident, by the course which they themselves pursued, that the kingdom of Jesus, although it was to transform and mould every human institution by its influence, had nothing to do directly with any earthly polity.

That Jesus wore the title of king need occasion no surprise. Among the Jews, the kingdom, from the outset, was a theocracy. When a human king was appointed, He "was king but in a secondary sense, as the deputy of the Invisible King, and the inspired depositary of His will."[1] It was God Himself who had called the nation, elected it to be His people; and it was He who had given its laws,

[1] Ecce Homo, ch. iv.

Royalty, therefore, had a deeper and higher meaning to the Jewish mind, than it bears in modern days. There was room for a wider, a spiritual conception. Christ was king, as He "claimed the character first of Founder, next of Legislator, thirdly, in a certain high and peculiar sense, of Judge, of a new divine society."[1]

When we review the New Testament history, it becomes clear that the kingdom which Jesus essayed to found was to have its seat in the hearts of men. To the question of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, He answered that the kingdom of God cometh not with observation;[2] it was not something visible, a spectacle for men to behold, and whose beginning could thus be precisely marked. "Behold," He added, "the kingdom of God is within you," or, as it should be rendered, "in the midst of you."[3] He in whom the kingdom had its origin stood with them; and the life of loyalty to God, the characteristic of the kingdom, was in Him and in the souls of the faithful men whom He had drawn into fellowship with His own spirit. When ambitious followers, or their relations for them, petitioned for places of honor near His throne, He replied that the chief rank in His Kingdom belonged to him who was most devoted to serving others, even as He had come not to be ministered unto, but to minister.[4]

Particular passages in which the kingdom is described in symbols drawn from the characteristics of the old dispensation are not to be construed with a prosaic literalness, but in harmony with the general drift and purport of the teaching of Jesus on the subject. He was to drink wine new with His disciples in the kingdom of His Father (Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 18); a figurative rep-

[1] Ibid. p. 36 (Boston, 1866). [2] Luke xvii. 20. [3] Verse 21.
[4] Matt. xx. 20-28, Mark x. 35-45.

resentation of the joys of that society which was to exist when the kingdom should appear in its consummated form. They were to sit with Him on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30); a mode of setting forth the share in His blessedness and glory, which everywhere in the New Testament is described as the destiny of His followers. Those who would unwarrantably press the language of these declarations, as if countenance were given in them to the ideas of a carnal Judaism, fail to remember the tropical style which is one of the obvious characteristics of the teaching of Jesus.[1] On the last night, having referred to the time when He had sent them out without purse, and scrip, and shoes, and yet they had lacked nothing, He told them to take purse and scrip, and bade each of them to buy a sword, even if he had to sell his garment to get the means of doing so (Luke xxii. 35, 36). In this vivid way, He contrasted the peril that was now coming upon them with a past day of comparative security. No one imagines that He meant the injunction to be taken literally, meant them to take up arms against their enemies. Yet at the moment they failed to apprehend His meaning; and He chose to turn from the subject, with the words—referring to the two swords which they said they had—"it is enough!" In describing the kingdom of which He was the founder and head, it was inevitable that He should draw upon the imagery of the Old Testament. In no other way than by these pictures could the Disciples be taught, imbued as they were with the prevalent conception which gave a predominantly material character to the Messianic reign. It was not by wholly discarding the figurative and poetic delineations of the kingdom that the truth involved in them

[1] Baur takes a sound view of these passages, regarding them as figurative. See his *N. T. Theologie*, p. 112.

was to be conveyed into minds on which abstract statements would fail to make a living impression.

Jesus, in repeated instances, bade those for whose benefit He exerted His healing power, be silent respecting the miracle and its Author.[1] In the early part of His ministry, especially, He guarded against any public proclamation of Himself as the Christ, and was willing to leave the multitude in doubt as to His precise mission and office.[2] Notoriety was ungrateful to Him. The motives of this procedure on His part it is not difficult to divine; and they corroborate the view which we have presented of His plan and aims. The throng, eager for the realization of the hopes of Israel, were impatient of delay. They looked to see the Messiah sit in visible glory on the throne of David, a terror to all their enemies. They would even take Him by force and make Him a king (John vi. 15). This popular aspiration He could not meet: He must do what He can to elevate and purify it. It was not hard to draw after Him a host of zealous adherents. He took all pains to thin the ranks of those who followed Him (John vi. 66), by acquainting them with the delusive character of their ideas concerning Him. He was not to give victory and glory to the theocracy; He was to suffer, and to die on the cross. Moreover, He must guard against precipitating the conflict with the ruling class, which He well knew could have only one issue, and must gain time to train His Disciples, and to plant in the world the seed of divine truth. Hence the prudence which He showed in withholding the full disclosure of His own claims, in avoiding needless publicity, and in postponing the inevitable conflict, which was a consequence of His teaching and His works, until He should have time to lay the foundations, firm and broad, of His spiritual kingdom.

[1] Matt. viii. 4, Mark viii. 26, 30, Luke v. 14, viii. 56, Mark vii. 36.
[2] Luke ix. 21, Mark ix. 9, Matt. xvii. 9.

But Jesus was consciously more than the founder of a spiritual society to be attracted out of the world of mankind which had become estranged from communion with God, by the force of His personal influence, and to have its life in Him. His kingdom was to act upon the world, and to bring the world under its sway. His Disciples were the "salt of the earth," the "light of the world," "a city set on a hill," a candle not hidden from sight, but set in a candlestick to shed light all around it.[1] His kingdom was to spread outwardly, and also to leaven human society with its spirit, until the whole world should be created anew by its agency.[2] The consummation of this beneficial conquest, to be sure, was to be reached in connection with a final manifestation of Himself, which is described throughout the New Testament as the Parusia (*παρουσία*), or Advent, when the sifting and separating operation incident to the Gospel in all the course of history reaches its climax. The twofold character of the kingdom, first as a transformation of the individual, and then as a world-conquering and world-purifying influence, is involved in all the teaching of Jesus, and formed the essential characteristic of His plan.

When we inquire for the means on which Jesus relied for the accomplishment of a revolution, the grandest which it ever entered into the heart of man to conceive—it being nothing less than the moral regeneration of mankind,—we find them to be in harmony with the elevated character of His aims. There is no occult policy. There is no elaborate contrivance of machinery. Everything is simple and as open as the day. The first of these means was teaching. Looking at His method or style, we find that not a little of His teaching was in gnomes, or brief, pointed sentences, easy to be remembered. This was a

[1] Matt. v. 13-17.

[2] Matt. xiii. 31–33, Mark xiii. 18-22.

method of conveying instruction which was in vogue among Rabbinical teachers. In the hands of Jesus it was made an instrument of unexampled potency. As the truth which He uttered was deeper, so the aphorism in which it was embodied was the more weighty. The use of parables was not something absolutely new. It had examples in the Old Testament and among the Rabbis. The immediate motive for the employment of this means of conveying knowledge was the advantage afforded by it for a lucid and vivid exhibition of the truth. In these narratives, as in pictures, the abstract reality was made to stand forth in a concrete form. Doctrine, precept, and argument were all incorporated in them in a way that could hardly be gainsaid. What reasoning could better justify, what eloquence could more impressively set forth, the compassion of God to sinful men than the story of the Prodigal Son? How could the narrowness which confines charity and kindly feeling to the limits of class and sect, be more effectually rebuked than in the tale of the Good Samaritan? How is the contrast of self-esteem and humility depicted in the story of the Pharisee and the Publican? There was another consequence connected with the method of teaching by parables. On the ear of those who were destitute of sympathy with the Teacher and His doctrine, and therefore lacked both curiosity and insight, they produced no effect. They awakened no desire to get at the truth that was wrapt up in them. On the contrary, those who felt the attraction of the Teacher, and wished to see clearly that of which they had gained a partial glimpse, could tarry and receive the enlightenment which they craved.[1] That others besides the Twelve took this way of gaining light, the Evangelists explicitly inform us. In this way, the parables served as the occasion for that sepa-

[1] Mark iv. 34.

ration between those who were susceptible to the influence of the truth, and those who were indifferent, or steeled against it. The latter class, hearing what they could not comprehend, and did not care to explore, went away as they came. Thus the Gospel had a judicial effect, dividing one from another, and proving itself to be a touchstone of character.[1]

It would be very strange if the teaching of Jesus had been confined entirely to the utterance of aphorisms and parables. All that is fairly meant by the statement in Matthew, that He spoke continually in parables (xiii. 34), is that they formed the staple of His popular discourses. The same Evangelist records the Sermon on the Mount. It is expressly said that in private converse with His Disciples, He expounded the parables to them (Mark iv. 34). And it is clear even from the Synoptical Gospels that in the company of His intimate followers, and sometimes elsewhere, He adopted the manner of continuous discourse, apart from parabolic illustration. That He should at times have taught in a style of consecutive address, as the Fourth Gospel describes, is surely what would be anticipated, and can properly occasion no surprise.

That Jesus adapted His communications, in both form and matter, to the mental and moral condition of His hearers, is made evident. The full blaze of truth would not have enlightened, but have dazzled and misled, those who were not prepared, by previous training, to recognize it. The minds of men, even of the Apostles, must by degrees be educated up to the apprehension of truth, which clashed in many of its features with their traditional ideas. Jesus compared Himself to a householder who brings out things both new and old.[2] The new doctrine was linked to the doctrine which was familiar to the auditor,—to

[1] Matt. xiii. 52.

[2] Matt. xiii. 13-15, Luke viii. 10.

the truths of the Old Testament. The new was held up as the complement of the old, and commended to acceptance as the corollary of accepted beliefs. Ideas that reached higher and deeper than anything before known, and which involved the eventual displacement of the whole fabric of the existing cultus, were so inculcated as not to produce an absolute break with the old system on the part of the disciples of the new. A bridge was laid between the two, so that there might be a continuity in the development of the minds of the disciples, that should correspond to the unity, which, notwithstanding the newness of the Gospel, bound together the two dispensations. With a wisdom so sublime were the foundations of the kingdom laid in the gradually educated perceptions and principles of those who were sympathetic with its spirit.

If our design were to describe at length the qualities of Jesus as a teacher, one topic would be the manner in which casual incidents and circumstances were made the occasion of bringing out fundamental truth. Principles which lie at the foundation of ethics and religion, and are the germ of changes of incalculable moment in the life of individuals and of society, were dropped, so to speak, by the wayside, in the form of a comment upon some occurrence, or as a response to questions pertaining to an immediate practical interest. The whole subsequent history of Christian society was to furnish, perpetually, new illustrations of the wealth of meaning which these wayside utterances contained, and of the power that lay in them to breathe a new spirit into the civilization of mankind.

Another means adopted by Jesus for the establishment of His kingdom was the selection of a band of Disciples who should be qualified by association with Him to promulgate the Gospel, and to act, in some measure, as His rep-

resentatives. It was not by a spontaneous act on the part of a portion of His hearers who felt themselves powerfully drawn to Him, that the band of disciples was formed. It was made up of those who did feel themselves thus attracted, but their separation from the rest of the believers, and the special place allotted them, was by the distinct appointment of Jesus Himself: "Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you" (John xv. 16). They shared at first with their countrymen the idea of the Messianic kingdom as an external exaltation of the theocracy. They were not wholly free from the hope of personal advancement under the new order of things.[1] But they were not so wedded to these ideas as to be indocile. They were capable of feeling the divine excellence of Jesus, and of yielding up, under the influence of His character and teaching, their previous hopes respecting the kingdom, and whatever personal ambition mingled with their sincere, disinterested allegiance to truth and righteousness. In their minds there were no impenetrable walls of prejudice to be demolished. There was no intellectual pride, or pride of caste, to obstruct the entrance of light. All, with the single exception of the Betrayer, were Galileans. At one time Jesus was moved to thank the Father from the depth of His soul, that in the righteous order of Providence truth which had been hidden from the wise and prudent, blinded by the conceit of wisdom, had been revealed to babes.[2]

The presence of Judas in this company has been to many a perplexing fact. But it is not to be assumed that he was bad from the start. We must suppose that Jesus discovered in him possibilities of good out of which might grow, in case the Disciple should put forth the moral exertion that lay in his power, a character fortified in goodness. The choice of the disciples was an act that gave them no

[1] Matt. xx. 21, Mark x. 37.

[2] Matt. xi. 25, Luke x. 21.

guaranty of salvation, and no exemption from the usual trial that attends every human being from the beginning to the end of life. Every thing turned on the use which Judas would make of the signal opportunities for good that lay in his path, and on the energy with which he would resist temptation. Respecting the foresight of Jesus *in statu humiliationis*, we should guard against rash dogmatic assumptions which the Gospel history does not warrant, and which would impart to His earnest exertions for the improvement of men a mechanical quality. He whose penetrating glance laid bare what was in man, watched with pain the downward steps of the unfaithful Disciple, and divined with unerring certainty the issue.[1]

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Disciples were set apart solely for the purpose of being qualified to report the teaching and testify to the miracles of their Master, and to proclaim the Gospel. It was not merely as instructors of their brethren that these men were brought into a daily intimacy with Jesus. They were, besides, links in the fellowship that Jesus came to establish with all who should receive Him in faith. A certain intermediate relation of this character was sustained by those whose impression of Jesus was immediate, the result of personal association with Him. Their intuition, their feeling, they sought to communicate beyond their own circle, that it might be reproduced in those who not having seen yet believed.[2] Thus through their instrumentality the bounds of the spiritual society of which Jesus was the centre and source were to be extended.

The Gospel was to be appropriated by all varieties of

[1] According to John's Gospel (vi. 70, 71), an opportunity was virtually given to Judas to withdraw from the company. Cf. Godet, *Commentaire* (2d ed.) in loco.

[2] See 1 John i. 3.

natural temperament and character. It was capable of being apprehended in diverse, yet not discordant, modes of conception. The types of doctrine which appear in the Apostolic teaching are the complements of each other, and conspire to make up a full representation of Christian truth.

The miracles of Jesus were another of the agencies which He employed in founding His kingdom. This part of the Gospel narratives it is, which, in modern times, has chiefly provoked skepticism. But a sound historical judgment must admit the reality of these events.

This is an historical question. It is high time that oracular assertions of the impossibility of such exertions of power as the New Testament attributes to Christ, or of the impossibility of proving them under any circumstances, should be set aside. It is impertinent, on the ground of some metaphysical scheme, an *à priori* conception of the universe, to set these arbitrary limits to the power of spirit over nature. If a system of philosophy cannot find room for facts well attested by historical evidence, so much the worse for the philosophical system. The procedure of the recent writers upon the Life of Jesus, in the treatment of the accounts of miracles in the Gospels, is commonly determined by their subjective conclusions or conjectures as to the control which may conceivably be exercised by will over matter. One will allow the historical verity of the cure of demoniacs, on the ground that such an influence on the part of Jesus is thought to be psychologically explicable, without departing so very widely from our ordinary experience. Another, like Strauss, would draw a line between the lighter and more manageable cases of demoniacal frenzy, which are allowed to have been subject to the control of Jesus, and the more aggravated forms of mental and physical disorder which were ascribed, truly, or not, to

diabolic possession. A large class of writers find no difficulty in accepting the narratives of healing said to have been effected by Jesus. They can imagine Him to have been possessed of an extraordinary, exceptional power over the diseased, enabling Him to subdue these maladies. But when it comes to the exercise of a control over inanimate nature, as in stilling the waves, or multiplying the loaves, they draw back with unbelief. But these seemingly highest exertions of miraculous power rest, as these writers are obliged to allow, upon the same historical attestation as the miraculous events to which they are willing to give credence. They are found recorded in what these writers are fully persuaded is the oldest part of the evangelical literature, the Gospel of Mark. It is not on historical grounds, but from considerations drawn from a quarter outside of historical study, that this arbitrary line of demarcation between the greater and the less, where all exceeds the measure of every-day experience, is drawn.

We say that a sound historical discernment, founded on a critical study of the documentary proof, must conclude that from the baptism of Jesus, He manifested the power to work miracles such as the Evangelists record. Nothing of the kind is attributed to Him before that epoch, when His public ministry began. Exaggerated views are often presented in regard to the credulity of the Jews at that time. They did indeed believe that God might send back to the world John the Baptist, or one of the older prophets. But that they attributed miracles to every one revered for his sanctity is false, as the example of John the Baptist, of whom no miracles are recorded, decisively proves. And that miraculous works were not supposed to be of common occurrence, or easy to be wrought, is demonstrated by the astonishment which everywhere in the narratives is shown to have been the effect of the miracles of Jesus.

An historical student, not warped by any preconceived metaphysical or physical theory, who surveys the whole field, will be persuaded that Jesus, with the prophecies before Him, never could have believed Himself to be the Messiah, had He not found Himself possessed of this power to work miracles. It is equally evident that had He not evinced this power in the most impressive forms, the Disciples, especially as He utterly abjured all political or revolutionary aims, would have disbelieved His claims. There would have been wanting what they considered the necessary credentials of the Christ. On examining the narratives, it is found that the works of Jesus are indissolubly connected with His undoubted words. The words presuppose the works, and, in certain cases, were occasioned by them. The works and the teaching of Jesus belong together. They form the totality of the manifestation, and cannot be divided more than the seamless garment which He wore. The mythical theory is wrecked upon a variety of difficulties which it cannot evade, or surmount. There was not time for a cycle of myths of this sort to arise, before the date of the earliest written Gospels. The circumstances, especially the presence of the Apostles, the recognized guides of the Church, would render it impossible. Besides, the Messianic idea, the alleged force out of which the myths are said to have sprung, had it been capable of such a product, would have precluded faith in Jesus so long as the expected and indispensable badges of a Messianic calling were wanting. In the Apostle Paul we have a witness to the early and unanimous testimony, on the part of the Disciples, to the Resurrection of the Lord.

What is the Rationalistic theory of the origin of the Christian Religion? It is that Jesus, a carpenter of Nazareth, with no prestige derived from birth or social standing, taught in Galilee for about a year—for to this period

the class of whom we speak would limit His public work. From these brief labors, made up wholly of verbal instruction, came that profound impression of His superhuman dignity, which was made indelibly upon His Disciples, and which His crucifixion as a criminal did not weaken, and that transforming power which went forth upon them, and, in ever increasing measure, upon all subsequent generations. The Apostolic Church, the conversion of Paul and his Epistles, the narratives of the four Gospels, with all that they contain, and Christianity, as it appears in the history of mankind, all spring from that one year of mere teaching! The effect is utterly disproportionate to the cause assigned.

It is much more consistent with a sound philosophy, instead of taking refuge in an unreasonable denial of facts historically established, to seek to comprehend them. At the outset, the notion should be banished that miracles are repugnant to nature; that the super-natural is anti-natural. There is one system; and supernatural agency, however it may modify the course of nature, does no violence to the universal order. For there is no such unbending rigidity in the course of nature, that it cannot be modified by the interposition of voluntary agency. A steam-ship, cutting its way through the billows in the teeth of wind and tide, moves by the force of machinery which is contrived and directed by the human will. The volitions of men produce an effect which nature, independently of this spiritual force, could never occasion. Now of the limits of the possible control of matter by the power of spirit, any more than of the essence and origin of matter itself, we cannot speak. It is a presumptuous affirmation that there is no being in the universe who can infinitely outdo the power of man, vast as it is, in this direction.

In the study of the Scriptural narratives of the miracles of Jesus, various interesting questions as to the mode in

which they were performed, suggest themselves. On the part of the Apostles, faith was an indispensable requisite,—a certain conscious fellowship with God, a laying hold of divine power.[1] Without this mental state, they were unable to do the work. For the want of it they failed in the attempt.[2] Of Jesus Himself it is said that at Nazareth, in His own country "He did not many works because of their unbelief" (Matt. xiii. 58). In Mark, the statement is: "He could there do no mighty work, save that He laid His hands upon a few sick folk and healed them" (Mark vi. 5). There is no ground for the assertion that He made the attempt to work miracles, and failed. What would have been the effect of such abortive efforts on the faith of His disciples in His Messianic claim? There is more plausibility, especially in view of Mark's statement, in the theory that the outgoing of the miraculous power of Jesus was, in the order of things, conditioned on faith in the recipient of the benefit,—that is conditioned according to some physical law; so that He was literally not able to perform the miracles where faith was absent. But this idea is not sustained by an examination of other parts of the evangelical history; and the meaning of the Evangelist may, perhaps, be exhausted if we assume that the want of faith on the part of the people, disabled Him in a moral sense—rendered it incompatible with His plan, and with wisdom, to exert His miraculous agency. At the same time, it must be remembered that the possession and exercise of these extraordinary powers are far removed from all kinship with magic. Rather do they fit into the universal system by links of connection which, in the present state of our knowledge, it may be impossible to detect, but the existence of which there is no reason to call in question.

[1] Matt. xiv. 31, xvii. 20, Mark xi. 22, 23, Luke xviii. 6.
[2] Matt. xvii. 17.

One conspicuous circumstance in the miracles was a requirement that those on whom, or for whose benefit, they were wrought, should have some degree of faith in Jesus. It is a fallacious objection—little more than a cavil—to say that proof of the Messianic commission of Jesus was thus afforded to those who already acknowledged it. The miracle reinforced faith. It fell in with all other expressions of the wisdom and goodness of Jesus, as a natural accompaniment. But the aim was to kindle a new spiritual life, and where the germ of this life did not exist, the miracle would have been in vain. A gardener waters the ground which exhibits any signs of fertility, but he does not pour water on the sand. The mere excitement of wonder, unattended by any deeper insight, was something that Jesus was sedulous to avoid. The introduction of a new life in humanity was the end in view; and in this creative agency divine power made itself signally manifest, not to extort a blind homage, nor to stir up a profitless amazement, but to bring the divine in more evident contact with souls inwardly prepared in some degree for the new fellowship. They whose consciences and hearts were not affected could attribute phenomena, the presence of which they were not able to deny, to diabolic agency.[1] Belief in the miracles is contingent on the impression made by the entire personality of Jesus, upon the feeling excited by His whole character and teaching, and by the moral transformation of which He is the Author. Where there is no adequate appreciation of the Gospel in these relations, the narrative of the miracles will be discredited.

Such was the plan of Jesus, and these the means on which He relied for accomplishing it. It was the establishment of a society of which He is the living Head; a

[1] Matt. xii. 24, Mark iii. 22, Luke xi. 15.

society the life of which is in its fellowship with Him. Each member of this society was to be a centre of light. By example, if not by active persuasion, He was to draw others into the right path. The followers of Jesus were to preach the Gospel everywhere. The world was to be conquered by preaching!

CHAPTER XV.

THE SEPARATION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE TEMPLE.

CHRISTIANITY was born of Judaism: it was the offspring of the Old Testament religion. How was it to break from the leading-strings of its parent, and to realize in consciousness the new and independent attributes that belonged to it? How was it to cast off the trammels that lay upon it of necessity at its origin, and to go forth in the freedom of its universal office as a religion for the world?

It might be expected, on a superficial view, that Christ would so explicitly define the relation of the new to the old, that no error and no perplexity could exist upon the question, and no interval be required to effect the transition. But to emancipate Christianity from its connection with Judaism by a mere dictum, to produce so momentous a change by a word of command, would not only contradict the usual methods of Providence, but violate the very nature of Christianity as a system resting on the intelligent apprehension of truth. A sudden, violent rupture with the Old Testament system was not a thing to be desired. Rather were the old things to pass away, not as the result of a fiat, but by the natural expulsive power of the new. It was not a method of antagonism and destruction, but of fulfilment. Hence Christ set forth the seminal ideas of the new kingdom, and left them, through the Spirit and the agency of Providence, to produce in their own time

the proper fruit. That the institutions of the Gospel were to be diverse from those of the old economy, was involved in what He said about Fasting, that new wine must be put into new bottles, that a new piece of cloth must not be sewed into an old garment.[1] He really undermined the ritual respecting meats and drinks, when He said that not what goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that defilement is of the heart, and comes through bad feelings and purposes.[2] He pointed out the essentials of goodness, when He taught that "mercy is better than sacrifice" (Matt. ix. 13), and that one who perceives that the love of God and man is "more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices" is "not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark xii. 33–34). The illustrations of the fulfilment of the law which He came to effect, in the Sermon on the Mount, relate exclusively to the moral law. How could Judaic exclusiveness long abide in connection with the Gospel doctrines of the infinite worth of the soul, the impartial benevolence and compassion of God, and love as the substance and end of the law? The conscious authority of Christ as competent to supersede that of the Old Testament enactments, is indicated in His precepts respecting divorce,[3] in His declaration that the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath,[4] and in His declaration that He and His disciples were bound by no obligation to pay the tax to the temple (Matt. xvii. 24–27).[5] How pregnant, in the cir-

[1] Matt. ix. 17; Mark ii. 22; Luke v. 37.

[2] Mark vii. 14–24. One verse (ver. 19) of this passage is quite explicit. The true reading is *καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα*—"which cleanseth all kinds of food." Cf. Meyer *in loco;* Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 259.

[3] Matt. xix. 8; Mark x. 5. [4] Mark ii. 28; Luke vi. 5.

[5] That the reference is to the temple-tax is proved by the term "children," which would not be used of the relation of Christ to the Roman sovereignty. That the disciples are included with Himself in the exemption from the obligation, is shown by the "we" in v. 27—lest "we should offend them;" although Meyer argues against this view.

cumstances under which it was made, was the declaration that "in this place is one greater than the temple!" (Matt. xii. 6). The temple—the seat of the Shechinah, the visible majesty of the divine presence — released the priesthood from the strict observance of the sabbatical law. They might offer their sacrifices. How much higher the claim to liberty on the part of the Disciples through their connection with Him! How natural to conclude that He who was greater than the temple is to take its place! How consonant with this declaration is the saying reported by John, that worship is to be confined to no sanctuary, but is acceptable to the Father when offered in spirit and in truth (John iv. 23, 24)! Then there were predictions of the downfall of the temple, of the letting out of the vineyard "to other husbandmen."[1] Above all, the one essential thing was made to be the relation of men to Himself; the single test of character was belief, or unbelief; the one source of communion with God was personal fellowship with Himself. This fundamental relation would eventually be seen to supersede every other priesthood and sacrifice. What was transient in the tenets and practices of the disciples, who had grown up under the Judaic system, would be cast off by the expansive force of the new truth.

Such was the teaching of Jesus with reference to the ceremonial law. He did not formally abolish it. He insisted on the subordinate value of sacrifices, and of ritual observances generally; He claimed a lordship over all that "was made for man;" but He did not sweep away by any express ordinance the worship of the temple, and He said nothing respecting circumcision.[2] That a certain prece-

[1] Matt. xxiv. 12, Mark xiii. 2, Luke xxi. 6, John ii. 19, Matt. xxi. 41, Mark xii. 9.

[2] This is substantially the conclusion of Ritschl, *Entstehung d. altkath. Kirche*, p. 34 (ed. 2).

dence belonged to the Jews in respect to the opportunity of hearing the Gospel was recognized in His own method of proceeding; but the Gospel was to be preached to every creature, and faith was made the condition of salvation.

We have now to trace the steps by which the Church became enlightened as to the privileges of the Gentiles, and gradually threw off the swathing bands which enveloped it in its infancy. We shall find that each of the leading Apostles had an appointed part, peculiar to himself, to fulfil, in the advance to this result. The authorities on which we depend for our knowledge of the facts, are the Epistles, in particular the Epistles of Paul—and here the second chapter of the Galatians is the most important passage—and the book of Acts by Luke. That the Gospel was to be carried to the heathen, all understood. The prophecies of the Old Testament, and the directions of the Master left no doubt on this point. But the question was what should be required of the heathen converts. In case they believed, were they not to be incorporated with the Chosen People by the rite of circumcision?

For a considerable time after the Ascension, the disciples constituted, to be sure, a body, fraternally united; and the force of the principle that bound them together is manifest in the picture, as it is drawn by Luke,[1] of the infant community, meeting for praise and fellowship, and pouring their property into the common treasury for the relief of the poor. But they were still Jews, frequenting the temple, observing the ritual, and not thinking that there could be any door of admission to the blessings of salvation for the Gentiles, except through circumcision and conformity to the ceremonies of the law. The Gentiles must become Jews, proselytes of righteousness, before they could

[1] Acts ii. 41-47.

gain access to the kingdom of Christ. To the conversion of the Jews their efforts were first to be directed.

The earliest symptoms of a more liberal view appear among Hellenists, the Greek-speaking Jews who had embraced the Gospel. We must guard against the supposition that the foreign Jews were uniformly of a more liberal temper than their brethren in Palestine. This was far from being always the case. They might even be stiffened in their legalism by their constant practical antagonism to the customs of the heathen. Yet sometimes the effect of this contact was to soften prejudice, and awaken sympathy. In the Apostolic history, the Hellenists first appear in the act of making a complaint that their poor did not get a due share of the common fund; which led to the appointment of seven deacons to relieve the Apostles of the whole business of distributing alms.[1] One of these was Stephen. He may have been of Hellenistic birth, although his name does not prove that such was the fact.[2] Stephen stands forth as a forerunner of Paul—the same Paul who took part in destroying him. His fervent preaching brought upon him a tempest of Jewish wrath. He was charged with speaking blasphemous words against Moses; and, before the Sanhedrim, he was accused of having said that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the temple, and "change the customs" which Moses had delivered (Acts vi. 14). These things were attributed to him by "false witnesses;" but something of the kind he had said to give occasion and material for the distorted representation. The tone of his defence accords with this hypothesis. Alluding to the temple of Solomon, he calls to mind the truth that the Almighty dwells not in temples made with hands. There is no disdain of the temple, for he speaks of it as built in response to the prayer of

[1] Acts vi. 1–6.

[2] Cf. Acts i. 23.

David (vers. 46, 47); but there is a large, spiritual view of the nature of religion. This is followed by an unsparing denunciation of the Jewish blindness, which of old had persecuted the prophets, and now at length had slain the Messiah.

The persecution for which the martyrdom of Stephen gave the signal, for the time broke up and dispersed the church at Jerusalem,—the Apostles only remaining in that city. This was in the year 33 or 34, about two years after the day of Pentecost. The result was a more decided step towards opening the doors of the Church to the Gentiles. Among those who were driven away from Jerusalem was Philip, another of the deacons, who went to a city of Samaria, the name of which is not given by Luke, and there preached with success; whereupon Peter and John came to give their sanction to the work, and lay hands upon the converts (Acts viii. 14 seq.). Such a lesson as Jesus had given in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, His rebuke of the spirit of the disciples when they would have called down vengeance on the heads of the inhospitable Samaritan villagers (Luke ix. 55), and his own labors at Sichem (John iv.), prepared the Apostles to give their countenance to this enterprise of Philip. The reception of the Samaritans who, although they believed in the law of Moses and were circumcised, were counted heretics by the orthodox Jews, paved the way, in some measure, for the communication of the Gospel to the heathen themselves. The conversion by Philip, and the baptism, of the Ethiopian chamberlain, who was not a Jew, even if he were a proselyte of the gate (which is doubtful), was a still more advanced measure (Acts viii. 27–40).

The next epoch in this history is the enlightenment of the Apostle Peter, through a vision, and his intercourse with the Roman Centurion, Cornelius, by which the prejudice of the Apostle is conquered, and he is convinced both

of the lawfulness of eating with a Gentile, and of the fact that the heathen may be admitted directly to share in the heavenly good offered in the Gospel (Acts x). That Peter had adopted these freer views is proved by his conduct at Antioch at a later day (Gal. ii. 12). It is difficult to conceive how so great a revolution of opinion and feeling could have occurred in such a man, without the intervention of some objective fact, like that which Luke records. Thus the credibility of Luke is supported by the probabilities in the case. The truth flashed upon the Apostle's mind that God is no respecter of persons, and that in every nation, "he who feareth Him and worketh righteousness" is accepted of Him, and may come immediately to Christ, and to God through Him. The brethren at Jerusalem, however, were not prepared for this catholic proceeding of Peter, and this new interpretation of the Gospel. They "contended against him;" they demanded an explanation. When Peter told his story, and appealed to the fact that the Holy Spirit was given to the Gentile believers in the same form and measure as to the Jews, the scruples of the Jewish Christians were satisfied (Acts xi. 18).

Meantime there were those who were carrying out the catholic principle on a broader scale. Among the fugitives from Jerusalem at the death of Stephen, some travelled as far as Phœnicia, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching only to Jews. But others of the same class were residents of Cyprus and Cyrene—Hellenistic Jews from those places, who had been converted to the Gospel—and these addressed themselves to the Grecians, the heathen, of whom a great number believed (Acts xi. 19–22). There were doubtless many earnest, truth-seeking men of the stamp of Cornelius, who were inwardly prepared, by sympathy with the Old Testament religion, to give welcome to the Gospel proclamation of forgiveness through Christ. Such men in-

directly aided even the Apostles in overcoming their prejudices. Antioch was the centre of these new converts; and when the news of the movement reached the Jerusalem church, Barnabas, himself a native of Cyprus, was sent to Antioch to look after it.

The great agent in the deliverance of Christianity from the bonds of Judaism now appears in the field. The year 35 is the probable date of the conversion of Paul. This young Pharisee, steeped in the lore of the school of Gamaliel,[1] and burning with zeal for the law with all its traditions,[2] was suddenly converted from an inquisitor, eager to hunt down the Nazarenes, into an equally ardent, but pure and humble, confessor of the faith which he had been striving to extirpate. In answer to the question how this change was effected, he had only one reply to make, that there was a revelation of Christ to him. It was not by the other Apostles, it was not by preliminary teaching, though the story of Jesus he was doubtless familiar with, that his conversion was produced (Gal. i. 12, 16; 1 Cor. xv. 8). The only point of attachment in his previous mental state, which his own statements, or the narrative by Luke, warrant us in assuming, is the sincerity and earnestness, however misdirected, with which he had embarked in what he considered the service of God. He had entered into the law-method of salvation with his whole heart and soul. The crisis in which it was revealed to him that Jesus was not a false, but the true, Messiah, was necessarily attended, or followed, by an inward revolution in his views, not less than in his temper and character. The reality of sin, and the inadequacy of law to cope with sin, or to purify conscience, stood before his mind in the clearest light; and hence the antithesis of the new dispensation to the old, of salvation by obedience and works, to

[1] Acts xxii. 3. [2] Phil. iii. 5, 6.

salvation by grace and through faith, was sharply defined to his mental perception. To require ceremonial observances of a believer—of a Gentile, obliged to them by no national custom—was to mix up two heterogeneous systems, to divide the work of man's salvation between Christ and a ritual, to make Him insufficient as a source of pardon and of fellowship with God. It was, in fact, another Gospel, a denial of the true Gospel. It was not to the ceremonial law alone, but also to all law, considered as a practicable means of righteousness, that Paul was hostile. It was the promises of the Old Testament, promises that antedated the Mosaic dispensation, which the Gospel carried out (Rom. iv. 12 seq.; Gal. iii. 17 seq.). During the three years next following his conversion, all that we know of Paul is that he went into Arabia, and "returned again to Damascus."[1] This fact of a sojourn in Arabia we learn from himself, and if known to Luke, it is not mentioned by him. Nor do we know whether this interval was passed in seclusion, or in preaching the new faith. Having returned to Damascus, he was obliged to flee from the hostility of the Jews, who were embittered against him from the outset, and through all his career; and then it was that, in the year 38, seven years after Christ had departed from visible intercourse with His disciples, Paul spent fifteen days with Peter in Jerusalem.[2] A memorable visit, and a fact fraught with interest in its bearing on the evidences of Christianity! Who can doubt that among the matters on which they would confer, none would be more prominent than the subject of the relation of the Gospel to the law, of the religion of Christ to the statutes of Moses? Thence Paul proceeded to Tarsus, his native city, and he is lost to our knowledge for the next five years—five busy years, we cannot doubt, in which he was endeavoring to convince men of the truth. In this

[1] Gal. i. 17.

[2] Gal. i. 18.

interval may have occurred the scourgings and the shipwrecks, of which he makes pathetic mention (2. Cor. xi. 24, 25), but which find no place in Luke's history. Tarsus was a cultivated city, and a seat of philosophical study. It is much more probable that Paul acquired his knowledge, such knowledge as he had, of Greek thought, from personal intercourse with those in whose company he would be cast, than from the study of the Greek authors. The strictness of his Pharisaical training would have naturally kept him away from heathen writings, nor does his style give evidence of a familiarity with them. He was educated in the Rabbinical schools, and traces of his youthful training are evident in his Epistles. At the same time, his powerful mind was quick to take up and assimilate whatever bore an affinity to Christian truth, in the current thinking with which he was brought into contact.

Barnabas, who had been sent by the Jerusalem Church to Antioch—who is a kind of connecting link between the two churches—entered heartily into the work of converting the heathen and gathering them into the Christian fold. Feeling the need of assistance, he went to Tarsus after Paul; and, in the year 43, brought him to Antioch, where they continued their labors together with great success.

About this time there occurred two events which were not without an important influence in keeping up a good understanding between the new community at Antioch and the mother Church.[1] One was the martyrdom of James, the brother of John, who was put to death by Herod Agrippa, in the year 44; in consequence of which the Apostles appear to have withdrawn from Jerusalem. This persecution, like that which followed the death of Stephen, led to an increase of missionary work abroad. James, the

[1] See Professor Lightfoot's Excursus, "St. Paul and the Three," *Galatians*, p. 293.

brother of Christ, from this time appears as the head of the Church at Jerusalem, having virtually the character and standing of an Apostle. The departure of the Apostles might naturally tend to lower somewhat the authority tacitly conceded to that Church. The other event was a famine, or dearth of provisions, which began in the same year, and lasted for a considerable time. The disciples at Antioch came forward with contributions for the aid of their poor brethren in Jerusalem. These gifts, Luke states (Acts xi. 30; xii. 25), were transmitted by the hands of Barnabas and Paul. But as Paul, in the 2d chapter of Galatians, where he carefully recounts the circumstances of his intercourse with the other Apostles, makes no mention of this visit, it is not improbable that he was prevented from accomplishing it. It is possible that he went for a part of the distance, and was prevented, for some reason, from entering the city; or the Apostles may have been absent.

The surprising growth of the Gentile Church at Antioch could not fail to excite attention, and awaken misgivings. There the disciples first began to be called Christians; and properly, for there they first became Christians in the full sense,—a body distinct from the Jews. Before, they had called one another "brethren," and had been termed by their enemies, by way of opprobrium, Nazarenes, Galileans, or Ebionites. It was natural that anxieties should arise at Jerusalem, when the Jewish Christians saw the rapid progress of the Gentile Church in the flourishing capital of Roman Asia. It was not now a question about a few individuals, as when Peter had succeeded in quieting the objections of those who were dissatisfied with his conduct in the affair of Cornelius. A multitude of the heathen were pressing in; and the question as to circumcision and the law must inevitably come up again for adjudication. Whatever fears and suspicions, however, may have arisen on

this score, they found, it appears, no public expression until a number of years after Paul had commenced his labors at Antioch. There were added to the Church at Jerusalem some converts from the Pharisaic party,—persons, it is likely, possessed of social influence, and retaining their strict views about the claims of the ritual, and the pollution incurred by intercourse with the Gentiles.[1] At length, on the return of Paul and Barnabas from their first missionary journey, the question was brought to an issue. Certain persons from Judea declared to the heathen converts at Antioch that unless they should be circumcised they could not be saved. This position Paul and Barnabas disputed. It was finally resolved that Paul and Barnabas and other deputies should go to Jerusalem and confer with the Apostles and elders there upon the subject of this debate.

Such was the occasion of the Apostolic Conference in the year 52; one of the principal landmarks in the history which we are pursuing. Of this convention we have an account in the fifteenth chapter of Acts; and, also, statements respecting the same visit from Paul himself, in the second chapter of Galatians. The two accounts are supplementary to each other, Paul's reference being to the private interview which he held with the Apostles, and Luke describing the general meeting before which the main question was laid.[2] Fourteen years had passed since Paul's first visit to Peter; seventeen years since his conversion, and about twenty-one years since the Resurrection of the Lord.

It was demanded of Paul by certain Judaizers that Titus, who was with him, should be circumcised; to which Paul returned a resolute denial. Titus being of Gentile extraction on both sides, and the demand being made by those who asserted that circumcision was necessary for salva-

[1] Acts xv. 5.

[2] See above, p. 308.

tion, Paul steadfastly refused to comply with it.[1] He explained to Peter, James, and John the character of his preaching. They had nothing to add to it; nothing to prescribe or suggest by way of addition or correction. But when they saw from the reports and information which they received, that Paul was doing a great work of God among the Gentiles, as Peter was doing a like work as a preacher to the Jews, they gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul and to Barnabas, and bade them God-speed. The converts of Paul were still to send up gifts for the poor Christians at Jerusalem, of whom there appear to have been many,—an act of fraternal kindness which the Apostle needed no entreaty to induce him to fulfil. At the more public assembly which Luke describes (although the language of Paul (Gal. ii. 2) implies that such a meeting was held),[2] there was a prolonged, and probably a heated, debate. At length Peter rose, and referring to his own experience in connection with the vision, and the conversion of Cornelius, gave his voice against the Judaizing proposition, and in favor of granting full liberty to the Gentile believers. Paul and Barnabas followed with a narrative of what they had done, and especially of the miracles which God had given them the power to perform in conjunction with their preaching. This had a decisive effect upon their auditors. James saw the hand of God, and, as was characteristic of him, saw the verification of prophecy, in the

[1] Did the "pillar" Apostles sympathize with the wish that Titus should be circumcised? Paul does not inform us on this point. Professor Lightfoot is inclined to think that at first they did. See his *Galatians*, p. 105. Whether they did or not, it is clear that they did not persist in this request, but supported Paul, notwithstanding his refusal to comply with it. Paul's style, (Gal. ii. 3, 4,) in referring to this transaction, his broken sentences, and "shipwreck of grammar," as Dr. Lightfoot calls it, betray his deep agitation of feeling, even in the recollection of the painful scene.

[2] See above, p. 302.

conversion of the Gentiles of which they had heard. His judgment was that these converts should not be troubled; that only a few restrictions should be laid upon them,—namely, that they should abstain from eating meat slain as an offering to idols, from fornication, from things strangled, and from blood. The import of the first prohibition we have already considered.[1] Blood, the symbol of the life, and made sacred for sacrificial purposes, might not be eaten by the Jew; and, for this reason, an animal killed by strangling, with the blood in him, was illicit food. To eat meat which had been laid upon a heathen altar might naturally be deemed complicity in heathen worship. The prescriptions are substantially those which were required of proselytes of the gate. There is a want of agreement as to the bearing of the reason assigned by James, and by the Council which accepted his judgment, for their proceeding: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day" (ver. 21). Does this mean that the Jews will be scandalized—the more because the law is so often brought to their notice—in case these things are not observed by the Gentile converts? Is the motive of the restriction, so far as the ceremonial points are concerned, one of expediency, to prevent needless offence to Jews and to Christians of Jewish birth? This is the more common interpretation; it is adopted by Meyer and by many other commentators.[2] There is something to be said in favor of another view of the passage, which Neander, among others, advocates, and which would paraphrase the verse thus: As for the Jewish Christians, they need no injunctions, inas-

[1] See above, p. 303 seq.

[2] Ritschl's idea of the passage is that inasmuch as there were, in all the cities, Jews to be won to the Gospel, for this reason even the Gentiles must observe these few things. *Enste. d. altkath. Kirche*, p. 129.

much as they know what they are to do from the written law which is read every Sabbath.[1] We are inclined, however, to the opinion of Erasmus, that the intent of the statement is to reassure those who feared that, if this exemption were granted to the Gentiles, the Mosaic law would be neglected or contemned by persons of Jewish birth. There was no fear of this; the law was read on every Sabbath. James seems to have held an intermediate position between the Judaizers on the one hand, and those, if such there were, who would abolish all ritual restrictions upon the Gentiles, on the other. He expected that the Jewish Christians—that branch of the Church—would continue to observe the Levitical ceremonies. This is shown in the xxist chapter of the Acts, in what he said to Paul on the occasion of his last visit to Jerusalem. So far all were agreed; for Paul was far from disapproving of circumcision and the other ritual customs, as practiced by Jews, and when regarded as a national, theocratic institute. His point was that they are not a means of salvation, a ground of justification, and are not to be imposed upon the Gentiles. He circumcised Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess; and he went through the ceremonies pertaining to a vow (Acts xxi. 26). He had the difficult part to perform of not appearing as an antagonist of Moses, an apostate from the Old Testament system, at the same time that he should stand squarely upon the higher plane of development which had been introduced by the Gospel, and save the new system from being adulterated by a mixture of obsolete elements drawn from the old. His consummate prudence and forbearance, through all this long controversy, are not less admirable than his unflinching courage in adhering to essential principles, whenever they were in peril, in the face of all adversaries. It is a question

[1] Plant. and Train. of the Church, p. 127.

whether James did not hold that, independently of the motive of expediency, and the desire not to offend a prejudice, these restrictions of the Apostolic decree were important to be observed on their own account. He, and those who sympathized in his views, gave up the great point of circumcision, and most of the prescriptions of the ceremonial law. They might feel that while the Gentile converts should be allowed their liberty to this extent, the practices prohibited in the decree—if decree it is to be called—were in themselves inadmissible.

When we connect what is said by Paul, in the 2d of Galatians, with the narrative of Luke, the position of James and of the Jerusalem Church becomes quite clear. The Gentile believers were looked upon as partakers of the great salvation, nothing being required of them except what was required of proselytes of the gate. They are the Christian Diaspora—they are even called so by Peter in his first Epistle—and a certain precedence belongs to the Mother Church, to the Jewish believers, as the first heirs of the promise. The temple is still the great sanctuary of worship; the expectation—the hope, at least—is that the chosen people, in a body, will acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah. The gifts which the older Apostles stipulated that Paul should bring up from the Gentile believers to the Church at Jerusalem, bore some analogy to the contributions which the Jewish Diaspora were in the habit of sending to the temple.[1]

The letter announcing the result of the Conference, addressed to the Gentile brethren in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, was conveyed by the hands of Paul and Barnabas, to whom were joined Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, or Silvanus—two leading men in the Church at Jerusalem

[1] The force of the Decree and its relation to Paul's doctrine and teaching, are considered in chapter ix. of the work, p. 301 seq.

—and was received at Antioch with joy. Silas was soon again at Antioch, and became a companion of Paul on his second missionary journey. The conclusion of the Conference served to calm the troubled waters. It really secured to the Gentiles an exemption from the yoke which the Judaizers would have laid upon them. But there were many questions which it did not decide, with respect to the relations of the Gentile to the Jewish converts. Or if it decided them logically and by fair inference, the legitimate corollaries might not always be deduced even by those who assented to the result in good faith. We have another chapter in the great controversy, in the conflict of Peter and Paul at Antioch, on a subsequent occasion. When this occurred we have no sure means of ascertaining. It was certainly after the Apostolic Conference. Peter was in that city. He had sat down at the *Agapæ*, or Love-feasts, with the Gentile brethren, and had eaten with them without any scruples of conscience. This course we should expect of him in view of what he had learned at the time of his intercourse with Cornelius, and of his utterances at the Council. Indeed, as we have said, his liberality of feeling, as manifested in his conduct, is not explicable except on the supposition of this prior enlightenment. But some persons came to Antioch "from James"—on what errand, we are not informed,—but they were persons of consideration in the Church of Jerusalem, and were among those who did not approve of this free intercourse with the uncircumcised, which Peter, in common with Paul and Barnabas, practiced. It was an exhibition of fraternal feeling which Paul deemed to be required by "the truth of the Gospel," the great doctrine of salvation by faith, and to be warranted by the Apostolic decree. It does not follow, however, that the visitors from Jerusalem gave so broad a construction to that document. They may have understood it simply as

conceding that the Gentile believers were brethren, and in a salvable condition; and yet they may have felt themselves authorized, and constrained by conscientious feeling, to stop short of that sort of social intercourse which might seem to sweep away utterly the barriers between Jew and heathen. They were influential persons; it is not unlikely that the same view of the Apostolic decree was taken by James himself. The presence of these Christians from Jerusalem led Peter, out of a timid deference to a prejudice in which he had shown that he did not personally share, to cease to eat with the Gentiles as he had done; and such was the force of his example, that the rest of the Jewish Christians at Antioch, including even Barnabas, took the same course. This crisis moved Paul to rebuke Peter, in the presence of the Church, for his cowardly and insincere compliance. He did not accuse him of holding a wrong principle, for his principles were right, but of inconsistency, and of infidelity to his real convictions. The effect of Peter's example, if it were not counteracted, would be to make the Gentile converts feel that they must "Judaize," or conform to the ceremonial ordinances of the law; and this influence would be specially potent from their seeing Peter change his course. Peter "had been condemned," for this is the meaning of the Greek (*κατεγνωσμένος ἦν*) which is rendered, "for he was to be blamed." "His conduct carried its own condemnation;"[1] but the phraseology probably implies that it was condemned by the Antiochian Christians who witnessed it.[2] Once more the Apostle Paul stood in the breach to defend the liberty of the Gentile converts, and to maintain the catholic character of the religion of Christ.

One thing was settled, so far as the united voice of the Apostles, and the prevailing judgment of the Jerusalem

[1] Prof. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, in loco.
[2] See Ellicott, and Meyer, *in loco*.

Church was concerned; and that was that the rite of circumcision was not to be imposed upon the Gentile believers. For this fact we have the testimony of Paul, in the Galatians, as well as of Luke. There might be differences on subordinate questions pertaining to the relations of the two sorts of Christians to each other; there might be Pharisaic believers still, who clung with characteristic pertinacity to the Judaizing tenets; but the Apostles were united in considering the Gentiles released from subjection to the Mosaic ceremonial law, and in recognizing them as fellow-heirs of salvation.

The Epistle to the Galatians was written in the year 56 or 57. Within the next two or three years, Paul wrote his two Epistles to the Corinthians, and his Epistle to the Romans. In this period, the Judaizers were active in their demonstrations of hostility to him personally, and in their efforts to pervert the Churches which were under his care. All this time, the Apostle keeps up his cordial and fraternal feeling towards the Jewish Apostles, and towards the brethren—the "saints" at Jerusalem—for whom he is collecting charitable gifts. There is no implication that his malignant adversaries were countenanced by them. He was waging an incessant war with a rancorous, intriguing faction, whose unchristian narrowness he condemns in the severest language. They are bigots, who are really aiming to subvert the Gospel. They might put the names of Peter and other Apostles on their party banners, for the sake of better opposing the Apostle to the Gentiles; but the whole tone of Paul is utterly inconsistent with the supposition that he held the other Apostles, or the Jerusalem Church as a body, responsible for the Judaizing tenet, or for the conduct of its malicious and mischievous advocates.

The Church at Corinth was disturbed by factions. Some claimed to be followers of Peter, others of Paul, and others

still of Apollos; while a fourth party, called into existence, it is not unlikely, by antagonism to the other three, claimed to be the party "of Christ." In the absence of definite knowledge as to the peculiarities of this last party, the most plausible conjecture is that which supposes them to have been inclined, with something of a rationalistic turn, to treat lightly Apostles and Apostolic authority altogether, and to have professed to go back to the instruction of Jesus Himself. The party that called itself by the name of Paul were probably disposed to push his free principles to excess; perhaps, as Marcion did afterwards, to dissever Christianity utterly from the Old Testament revelation. The adherents of Apollos probably mingled with personal partiality for this teacher, an infusion of Alexandrian "wisdom," or a type of thinking which they claimed to derive from him. The Apostle, it is obvious, is no more disposed to countenance the party of Paul, than that of Cephas. Precisely what this last party contended for, we are not told. It is not intimated, however, that, like the Judaizers in Galatia, they demanded that the heathen converts should be circumcised. It is safe to say, that they called for a more legal type of piety, and claimed a higher precedence for the Judaic branch of the Church than the followers of Paul were ready to admit. In the Second Epistle, the Apostle speaks with severity of persons who had come to Corinth with letters of recommendation from Jerusalem, and who took similar letters on leaving Corinth from the Church there.[1] He calls them sarcastically "supereminent Apostles,"[2] "false Apostles,"[3] and deceivers. That these expressions refer to Peter and his co-apostles at Jerusalem, is one of the baseless assumptions of the school of Baur. Paul speaks of himself as "rude in speech,"[4] in comparison with those enemies,—an expression which he

[1] 2 Cor. iii. 1. [2] 2 Cor. xi. 5 [3] Ver. 13. [4] xi. 6.

would not have used with reference to the Jerusalem Apostles. Of these he speaks in a totally different tone from that in which he refers to the mischief-makers who claimed to be their adherents.[1] For the true Apostles and for their flock, "the saints" at Jerusalem, he was even then soliciting gifts.

While the Apostle was staying at Corinth, and just prior to his last eventful visit to Jerusalem, he wrote his Epistle to the Romans. The whole tone of it indicates an earnest desire on his part that there should be a good understanding between him and the Church in the capital. He had long wished to visit Rome, and to prosecute there his work as a preacher to the Gentiles (i. 13–15). Now the intention which he had formed of going to Spain rendered it probable that this purpose might be fulfilled (xv. 24). He hoped to meet his Roman brethren, and after a sojourn with them, to be helped forward by them on his journey to the western frontiers of the Empire (ver. 24). It is evident, from this Epistle, that the Roman Church was made up partly of converts from Judaism, and partly of Gentiles. Each of these classes he directly addresses. "Know ye not brethren (I speak to them that know the Law)" (vii. 1), is the beginning of an argument to Jewish Christians.[2] In another place, he writes: "For I speak to you Gentiles" (xi. 13); and this is followed by an extended appeal to this class. A conciliatory tone pervades the Epistle. He is an Israelite himself; his fervent prayer to God is, that the Jews as a body might be converted to the Gospel. He would be willing to be accursed for their sake (ix. 3)! He believes, notwithstanding their temporary unbelief, in a hidden intention of God, that this prayer shall be verified.[3] His hope was like that of the

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 22, iv. 1.
[2] cf. ii. 17 seq., vii. 4.
[3] cf. i. 13, x. 1 seq., xi. 17, 21, 22, 25, 28, xv. 16.

older Apostles, that "all Israel" should be brought in! It is clear, in the first place, that the Jewish Christians in the Roman Church were relatively numerous; whether they outnumbered the Gentile converts or not, nothing in the Epistle enables us to decide. It is evident, secondly, that they stood in no hostile relation to the Apostle. This is conceded by Baur. But, thirdly, it is impossible not to see that the Apostle had some apprehension that the natural jealousy awakened by the growth of the Gentile Churches, in connection with the unscrupulous efforts of his Judaizing antagonists, might imperil his relations with the Jewish Christians generally. With the utmost earnestness he begs for the prayers of his brethren at Rome that on his approaching visit to Jerusalem, he may not only be delivered from the malice of unbelieving Jews, but may have a good reception from his Jewish brethren there (xv. 30-32). While this Epistle is so mild in its tone of opposition to Judaic pretensions, since the Judaizing demand that the Gentile Christians should be circumcised had not yet been made at Rome, it contains the most radical vindication of the liberty of the heathen converts. The method of salvation by obedience to the law is set in the sharpest contrast with the method of salvation by the grace of the Gospel. Whoever accepted the doctrine of this Epistle must have felt that compliance with the ceremonial code of the Old Testament could no longer be enforced on the ground of religious obligation.

It was in A. D. 59, that the Apostle carried up to Jerusalem the contribution which he had collected among the Gentile churches. It was not the will of Providence that the prayer for his deliverance from Jewish enemies should be fully granted. The graphic narrative of Luke (Acts xxi.) shows how he was warmly received by "the breth-

ren" (ver. 17). On the day after his arrival, he held an interview with James and the Elders of the Church. His account of the spread of the Gospel among the heathen excited a cordial interest, and called forth expressions of gratitude to God. But James proceeds to inform him that the multitude of Jewish Christians at Jerusalem had been told that he was in the habit of advising the Hellenistic Jews to "forsake Moses," and not to circumcise their children. A cloud of suspicion rested upon him. The Jewish Christians, he was reminded by James and the Elders, were zealous for the law,—that is earnest that the law should be observed by all who were of Jewish birth. As for the Gentile believers, they said, the prescriptions of the Council defined what was expected of them. It is obvious that the point on which James and the body of the Jewish Christians insisted, was that among Jews and Jewish believers conformity to the ritual should be maintained. Nor, we repeat, is this a matter of surprise; since there was a national as well as a religious feeling involved, and since they did not despair of the conversion of their countrymen as a body. To give up the old observances would have seemed to them like a relinquishment of this hope. Paul found no difficulty in acceding to the wish of James and the Elders that he should give a public proof of the falsity of the charge that he was trying to persuade the Jews to abandon their ceremonial observances. He had not taken this course, and was willing to satisfy those who had been misled by false reports, that he was no enemy of Moses, and was not the renegade that his maligners asserted him to be. How far he sympathized with James in his view as to the continued obligation of the Gentile converts to conform to all of the recommendations of the Apostolic Council, is a question that must be determined by a careful examination of his Epistles; since on this

point the narrative of Luke is silent.[1] The Jews from Asia, who were in attendance upon the festival, seeing Paul in the temple, raised a cry against him, declaring, in addition to the imputation which had been disseminated among the Jewish Christians, that he had also brought a heathen into the temple.[2] This last charge, as Luke with admirable candor explains, sprang out of a mistake. Trophimus, an Ephesian, had been seen with him, and it was rumored that Paul had taken him into the temple.

Subsequent attempts of the Jews, by legal process and by the plots of assassins, to destroy him were baffled by the protection afforded him by the Roman authorities, and by his appeal to Cæsar.[3] His Epistles written from Rome show that the Judaizing antagonism had appeared there. He writes to the Philippians[4] that some near him are preaching Christ "of envy and strife"—in a quarrelsome and partisan spirit, in the hope, by organizing a hostile party, to make his chain more galling. Yet he does not speak of them with the strong denunciation which he had leveled against the Galatian Judaizers. These last were not attempting to convert men even to their imperfect doctrine, but only to mislead the Gentile believers. The malignants at Rome were at least laboring to procure the acknowledgment of Jesus as the Christ. What a love to Christ and His cause must have inspired the soul of Paul, that he could rejoice in efforts which sprang from motives so wanting in purity, and so prejudicial to his own comfort and good name! Writing to the Colossians, he shows that the Judaizers were not without a following. He says that only three active workers among the Jewish Christians, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus, stood by him as auxiliaries.[5]

[1] On this question, see above, p. 303 seq.
[2] Acts xxi. 29.
[3] Acts xxiii. 12-31, xxiv. 1 seq., xxv. 2.
[4] Philippians i. 15–18.
[5] Col. iv. 10.

Such was the position of the Apostle in relation to Jews, Jewish Christians, and Judaizers, when the veil falls upon this portion of his history.

In rejecting the exaggerations of the Tübingen school, it is important not to overlook the diversities that actually existed in the Apostolic Church, and among the Apostles themselves. It is natural to ask why the "pillar" Apostles did not vigorously support Paul when the demand was made that Titus should be circumcised, and why they did not put under the ban the Judaizers among the Galatians, at Corinth, and elsewhere, who were doing all they could to impede his work? A satisfactory answer to these questions is that the Apostles did not arrogate to themselves the function of rulers, in any hierarchical sense, over the Christian communities which were springing up all over the Roman Empire, and especially would they avoid interference with distant churches, with the circumstances of which they were imperfectly acquainted. They would have been as little disposed to interpose, as Paul would have been to admit their interposition, in the conflicts between him and factious opponents in the churches which he had planted. The Apostles preferred to act as prophets rather than as bishops, and to do good by personal influence, rather than by official prerogative.[1] Wesley and Whitefield in the Methodist movement, Luther and Calvin in the Protestant Reformation, have been suggested as not inapt illustrations of the relations that existed among Apostolic laborers who seldom met one another, and who, though devoted, heart and soul, to the common cause, might find in one another something to criticise.[2] The Jewish Christians, all of them, were attached to the legal observances, and it might not be so easy

[1] See Professor Jowett's remarks, *Epp. of St. Paul*, p. 430 seq.

[2] Ibid. p. 435.

to draw the line where this feeling passed into an immoderate and intolerant zeal. The varieties of personal character among the Apostles should not be overlooked. In Peter there was a mingled boldness and timidity—a boldness like that of Luther, which might suddenly give way, however, to a timidity like that of Melanchthon. An example of this fluctuation of temper was given at Antioch when his courage suddenly gave way in the presence of strict legalists from Jerusalem. As to James, his dress and manner of life are depicted in an extract which Eusebius gives from the old Jewish Christian historian Hegesippus;[1] and although Ebionitic legends are mingled in this description, yet we are led by all our sources of information to conceive of him as a devout and punctilious observer of the ancient ritual. To prevent the Jewish Christians from forsaking the ordinances of the law was with him a matter of much importance. The wrath of the Jews which nearly cost the Apostle Paul his life in his last visit to Jerusalem, did not at that moment bring into peril his fellow-Apostles. They were not suspected of attempting to draw away either Jewish Christians or Jews from the Mosaic ceremonies. It is false to say that these Apostles refused to recognize Paul and his converts as brethren. It is true, however, that the liberty for the Gentiles, which he was so full of ardor in maintaining, did not in an equal degree engage their zeal.

From about the time of the Apostle Paul's final visit to Jerusalem, the history of the Jewish branch of the Church is involved in obscurity. There is no doubt that providential events had a decisive influence in breaking up the allegiance to the old ritual, of those who were not hopelessly wedded to it. In the year 66, began the great war, when the Jews of Palestine flung themselves with reckless

[1] *H. E.* ii. 23.

courage into the deadly struggle with their Roman oppressors. In the year 70, Jerusalem was captured by Titus, and, amid horrible carnage, the temple was given to the flames. For three years longer, after Titus had enjoyed his triumph, the war was continued. From that time, the prostrate people, having no longer a Jewish magistracy in the proper sense, and with their sanctuary in ruins, had no rallying point except the law, as preserved and expounded by the Scribes. Later, they made two other desperate attempts to beat down their enemies. First, in A. D. 115, in the last part of Trajan's reign, the Jews of Cyrene rose in revolt. The conflict, which was attended with enormous destruction of life, spread to Alexandria, and then to Cyprus. There had been a frightful massacre of the Greeks in Cyrene; and in Cyprus, Dion Cassius states that 220,000 of the non-Jewish population were slain.[1] The result was that the Jews were vanquished, and none of their nation were suffered to step foot upon the island. The Jews in Mesopotamia followed the example of their brethren, and were likewise put down. The Jewish traditions set the number of their people slain at this time in Egypt and Cyprus at 600,000.[2] Once more, in A. D. 132, under Hadrian, who had forbidden the continuance of the rite of circumcision, a great insurrection of the Jews broke out, which was not confined to Palestine. There the leader was Bar-cochab—son of the star—"the star that was to arise out of Jacob"—who gave himself out as the Messiah. In this war, into which the Jews threw themselves with the same splendid daring and indomitable fortitude which they always showed in contests for their freedom and their religion, the number of those who perished by the sword is given by Dion Cassius at 580,000, besides the uncounted multitude who were destroyed by famine, dis-

[1] Lib. lxviii. 32. [2] See Milman's *History of the Jews*, ii. 429.

ease, and fire.[1] The captives were brought in droves to the slave-market. Judea was devastated. Then Hadrian, in A. D. 135, converted Jerusalem into a heathen city, giving it the name of Ælia Capitolina. The Jewish rites of worship were forbidden. Heathen temples were erected; and the image of a swine was placed over the door leading to Bethlehem.

With the downfall of Jerusalem, the curtain falls upon the Church of the Circumcision. Henceforward our information respecting it is obscure and scanty. At the outbreaking of the Jewish war, the Christians had withdrawn to Pella, lying on the east of the Jordan. At an earlier day, James had been put to death, a victim of Jewish intolerance. If, as there is reason to believe, the reference to this event in Josephus is genuine,[2] it took place at the instigation of the High-Priest, Ananus, in the year 62; and this is one proof that the account of this event which Eusebius reproduces from the old Jewish Christian historian, Hegesippus, is, in part at least, legendary. It would appear that a portion of the exiled church came back to Jerusalem after the war of Titus was over. Hegesippus states that Symeon, the son of Clopas, a paternal uncle of Jesus—Clopas was the brother of Joseph—was appointed bishop there after the murder of James; and that he, having lived to a very advanced age, perished as a martyr in the year 106.[3] The Christians had stood aloof from the contest with the Romans, on which the Jews staked their existence as a people. The murder of James indicates that, as the crisis was approaching, the feelings of the Jews had become more embittered against their Christian countrymen. Justin Martyr informs us that in the subsequent insurrection, led by Bar-cochab, the Chris-

[1] Lib. lxix. 14.

[2] Antiq., xx. 9, 1.

[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 21, iii. 32.

tians were fiercely persecuted by this fanatical leader.[1] In this whole period, we learn from Jewish sources that the Christians were regarded with animosity by them, and were loaded with anathemas. Thus all the circumstances conspired to weaken the bond which had held the Jewish Christians to the Mosaic ordinances. It is highly probable that many of them were in the restored church of Jerusalem, and were satisfied with the Christian worship which was now clear of the ancient ritual. In truth, it is not certain that the rites of Jewish worship were permitted there after the conquest by Titus.[2] After this time, the Jews did not attempt to make Jerusalem their capital. They resorted to Jabneh (now Yebna), nearer the sea-coast, and just beyond the northern border of Judea. Up to the war made by Bar-cochab, this place was the centre of their learned schools, and the seat of their Sanhedrim.[3]

The Church was separated from the temple by the destruction of the temple. It was prior to this event that the Apostle John, and others with him, of whom Philip the Apostle was one—for it is probably the Apostle who died at Hierapolis, and not the Evangelist of that name—removed his abode to Asia Minor. The catholic spirit in which John carried forward his Apostolic work until he reached an extreme old age, is evinced by his writings, and by the traditions which relate to this period of his activity. The Jewish Christians who could not bring themselves to the adoption of the full freedom of Pauline principles fall into three classes. If we may credit the statement of Hegesippus, which, in this particular, there is no reason to distrust, they first broke off from the Church on the death of Symeon (A. D. 106).

[1] Apol. i. 31.

[2] See Renan, *Les Évangiles*, p. 17.

[3] See Derenbourg, *Hist. et Géog. de la Palestine*, ch. xxiii., Milman, *Hist. of the Jews* (Am. ed.), ii. 412, 449, 451.

Shortly after the war of the Jews against Hadrian, Justin Martyr makes mention of two classes of Jewish Christian sectaries, a milder party who adhered to the Mosaic ritual for themselves, with no hostility to the Gentile churches, and a stricter faction who would compel the Christian Gentiles to live according to the law of Moses.[1] These are evidently the parties which are known to later writers as Nazarenes and Ebionites. The Ebionites are described by Irenæus,[2] Hippolytus,[3] and Tertullian,[4] the first of whom refers to the enmity of this sect to the Apostle Paul. They used the "Gospel of the Hebrews," which they ascribed to Matthew. They are also described by Epiphanius, in the fourth century, although the objects of his denunciation are strongly tinctured with Essene peculiarities.[5] But Origen expressly distinguishes two divisions of the Ebionite heresy.[6] The one accepted, the other rejected, the miraculous birth of Jesus from the Virgin. Jerome enters into an explanation of the tenets of this more liberal sect of Jewish Christians,[7] in which we may plainly discern the successors of that portion of the Judaic Church which could not bring itself to the surrender of the Mosaic observances, at the same time that they recognized as brethren the Gentile believers, and honored the Apostle Paul. In the rigid Ebionites, we see with equal distinctness the remnant of the Pharisaic or Judaizing faction which had persistently attacked the doctrine and person of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

There is a third class of Judaizing Christians, existing under various modifications, with an ascetic and speculative tendency which is Gnostic in its character, and stamped with peculiarities akin to those of the Essenes. The pres-

[1] Dial. c. Tryphon., 47, 48.
[2] Ref. omn. Hær., vii. 22, x. 18.
[3] Hær., xxx.
[4] Adv. Hær., I. xxvi. 2.
[5] De Præscr. Hæret., 33.
[6] c. Celsum, v. 61, 65.
[7] Ep. 89 ad Augustin.

ence of this type of Judaizing doctrine at Rome would seem to be indicated by one or two passages in the Epistle of Paul to the Roman Church.[1] Much more evident is the existence of sectaries of this class among the Colossians. That the Essenes had found their way to that part of Asia Minor is not at all impossible. The relation of the Hemerobaptists, disciples of John the Baptist, who formed themselves into a party or sect in that region, and whose presence is tacitly presupposed in John's Gospel, to the Essenian Gnostics is involved in obscurity. But in Cerinthus, the Judaizing Gnostic, whom the tradition states to have been the antagonist with reference to whom the Evangelist wrote his Gospel,[2] we have a representation of the Essenian Ebionism, or, at least of a way of thinking resembling that which arose under the Essenian influence. The Essenes in Palestine were brought into connection with the Jewish Christians in the year 70, when the latter fled to Pella and the adjacent district. Here it would seem that many of the Essenes embraced the Gospel, not abandoning, however, many of their previous sectarian characteristics. The Elchesaits, to whom Origen refers,[3] were the offspring of this union of Judaic Christians with Essenism. The principal monument of the Essenian Ebionitism is the Pseudo-Clementine writings, whose date is somewhere in the latter part of the second century.[4]

There are New Testament documents which indirectly throw light upon the present topic. The Epistle to the Hebrews, written, it is probable, by a pupil of the Apostle Paul, by one imbued with his spirit and principles, not

[1] Rom. xiv. 2, 21. [2] See above p. 345. [3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, vi. 38.

[4] Upon the Jewish Christian sects, see Gieseler's Essay in Stäudlin u. Tzschirner's *Archiv. f. Kirchengesch.*, iv. 2, Schliemann, *Die Clementinen* (1844), Ritschl, *Die altkath. Kirche*, pp. 108–248, Prof. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 304 seq. See, also, *Essays on the Super. Origin of Christ.*, p. 311 seq.

long before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, discloses the fact that among the Jewish Christians, for whom it was composed—whether they were residents of Palestine or of Rome, is uncertain [1]—there was danger of a Judaizing schism. The Epistle of Peter—the First Epistle—is placed by Eusebius among the Homologoumena, or books universally received.[2] It was in the hands of Polycarp, as Eusebius states, and as we know from an inspection of Polycarp's Epistle;[3] and the same historian tells us that it was used by Papias.[4] Peter wrote his Epistle from Babylon,[5] where, on account of the number of Jews there, he might naturally be found. It was written to the Christians of Asia Minor, was transmitted by the hand of Silas[6] who, originally of the Jerusalem Church, had been a fellow-laborer with Paul; and it sends a greeting at the end from Mark.[7] It contains assurances of fraternal confidence in the Gentile believers of those churches which Paul had built up. It must have been written near the end of Peter's life, and possibly it was written after the death of Paul, which occurred at Rome, in the year 64. Not long after this event, Peter himself likewise perished as a martyr, probably in the same place.[8]

The Epistle of James has strong external attestation, it being found in the old Syriac version; and it presents internal marks of authenticity. One aim of it was to correct abuses which had grown up in connection with the doctrine of justification by faith alone,—perversions of which the Marcionite heresy, at a later period, was a marked example. There is no Judaizing doctrine in this Epistle;

[1] See the discussion of this question in Bleek's *Einl. in d. N. T.* (ed. Mangold), pp. 608-612.
[2] *H. E.*, iii. 3.
[3] Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 15, Westcott, *Canon of the N. T.*, pp. 34, 35.
[4] H. E. iii. 39. [5] 1 Pet. v. 13. [6] Ibid., iv. 12. [7] Ibid., v. 13.
[8] See below, p. 514.

yet it dwells on points of Christian duty, upon the necessity of works where faith is not dead, and of the Gospel as the perfecting of the law, in just the strain which we might expect from the evangelical, yet intermediate, position of its author.

The transference of the Apostle John to Asia, whose residence there for a long period is a fact well established,[1] probably took place, as we have already stated, after the death of Paul, and before the Jewish war and the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans. The Apocalypse, which was written in the period of the Neronian persecution, is strenuous against compromises with heathenism, and speaks of fornication and of the eating of things offered to idols, in terms which imply a conscious reminiscence of the Apostolic decree; but this book, when fairly interpreted, exhibits no trace of a Judaizing spirit. The Gospel of John, and his 1st Epistle, which were written much later than the Apocalypse, show how completely the catholic interpretation of the Gospel had leavened the mind of the Apostle. That such was the tenor of his teaching in Asia Minor, not only the tone of his writings, but also the character of his influence, as it is manifest in the whole spirit of the writers of the second century, Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, fully establishes. What part John took in the earlier discussions, we have no means of learning. He is one of the "pillars" of the Church at Jerusalem on the occasion of the Council;[2] one of the Three who gave to Paul the right hand of fellowship. It does not appear that he was there when Paul made his last visit, and was attacked by the mob of Jews. But of the broad and charitable spirit which he manifested at Ephesus, in the closing period of his activity, we have sufficient evidence.

[1] See above, 327 seq.

[2] Galatians ii. 9.

The theory has been advocated in recent times by Baur and his school, that in the closing part of the first century, the Judaizing party had gained a controlling influence in the Gentile Churches, so that the name and writings of the Apostle Paul fell into disrepute; and that afterwards a reaction followed, and a harmonizing tendency, which brought the Pauline interest again into favor. Of such a double revolution, the ecclesiastical writers, on whom we must depend for our knowledge of that period, know nothing. It is impossible that changes of this remarkable character should have taken place in the churches of Asia Minor, and in the Church at Rome, and yet have escaped the knowledge of Irenæus. He, like Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, appeal to the unbroken tradition of Apostolic teaching, and to the fact of a recognition of the authority of all the Apostles by the churches from the beginning. Justin Martyr's theology is thoroughly repugnant to Ebionism. When we go still farther back, to the preceding generation, we find the same to be true of the Epistle of Clement of Rome, the Epistle of Polycarp, and the Ignatian Epistles. Very precarious arguments are deduced by advocates of the Tübingen theory from fragmentary passages of lost writings of Hegesippus and of Papias. But an Ebionism which Irenæus and Eusebius, who had the entire works of these authors in their hands, failed to detect, could not be of a very pronounced character. Besides, there are statements of Hegesippus which are inconsistent with the supposition that he was an Ebionite;[1] and the historical position of Papias in relation to Polycarp and Irenæus is sufficient of itself to refute this imputation as applied to him. The Tübingen hypothesis had for its main support an altogether exaggerated idea of

[1] See the notice of his statements respecting the Church at Corinth, and Clement's Ep. to the Corinthians, in Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv. 22.

the influence obtained by such peculiarities of doctrine as appear in the spurious Clementine Homilies. These exhibit a particular type of that form of Ebionism which had been shaped under the Essene influence. That these singularities of opinion ever prevailed in the Roman Church, or in the churches generally, is not only a proposition devoid of proof, but it is contradicted by clear historical testimonies. Unconscious deviations from the Pauline doctrine, and ascetic elements, that manifest themselves in the theology of the second century, imply no such ascendency of Ebionism. They are found in writers of that and the following centuries, by whom the name and works of Paul were held in the highest reverence.

In the decade that precedes the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, the Christians, as we learn from the account of the Neronian persecution by Tacitus,[1] had come to be recognized among the heathen as a sect distinct from the Jews; and so in Judea itself, as we have seen, with the growth of the fanaticism that blazed out in the war against Rome, the hostility of the Jews to the Church kept pace. The tendency of this persecution must have been to build up a wall between the Jewish Christians and their hostile countrymen. It has already been suggested that the fall of the temple, with the capital, which crushed the hopes on which the Judaical spirit in the Church had fed, must have compelled many who were less obstinately wedded to the old ritual, to fall in with the more free type of Christianity which was now spreading over the Roman world. In short, while the Jewish Christian branch of the Church was shattered and divided, Gentile Christianity was taking root, and drawing multitudes within its fold. Hence, early in the second century, the churches are everywhere found to be free from bondage to Judaic observances,

[1] See below p. 529.

and the Jewish type of Christianity remains only in the factions, one more tolerant, and the other rigid, which exist outside of the pale of Catholicism.

From the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Tertullian, we are able to gain an intelligent view of the Church Catholic as it existed towards the close of the second century.[1] It is evident that the distinct conception of justification by faith alone, and the profound idea of faith, as these truths are set forth in the writings of Paul, are no longer vividly present in the Christian consciousness. Not that there is a conscious antagonism to this type of doctrine, but there has sprung up a certain legalism, a Christian legalism, to be sure, which involves a perceptible difference from the Pauline theology. It is a rash conclusion, however, which attributes this phase of doctrinal opinion to a Judaic influence, or to the effect of a compromise between two contrasted theologies. It must be remembered that the legal tendency may spring up, in any age, among those who accept, and sincerely profess to revere, the writings of Paul. It must not be forgotten that it is only two of the Epistles of Paul, that to the Romans and that to the Galatians, which present the doctrine of justification and of faith, with the sharp statement consequent upon the need of combating antagonistic errors; and that the other New Testament writings, besides those of Paul, were equally in the hands of the early Church. The Fathers, whom we have named,

[1] The term Catholic Church (ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία) first occurs in Ignatius (ad Smyrn., viii.). It is found three times in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*—first in the superscription, and then in cc. viii. and xix. In c. ix., however, it is only to the Church of Smyrna, collectively taken, that the epithet is applied. See, also, *Shepherd of Hermas*, iii. 17, where the universal Church is referred to. Clement of Alexandria speaks of the "Catholic Church" as antithetical to heretical sects. *Strom.*, VII. xvii. (ed. Potter, p. 899).

and their contemporaries, so far as their theology varied from the teaching of Paul, were led into this deviation, not by any opposition to him, whose authority they had no thought of disputing, nor by the influence of Judaism. All the evidence on the subject points to one conclusion, viz., that the old Catholic Church, as it formed itself in the second century, grew out of that common Christianity which had honored alike all of the Apostles. This Church had its centres and strongholds in the Gentile communities where Paul had been the principal teacher, and where his memory was reverently cherished.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

At the outset of the history of the spread of Christianity by the labors of the Apostles, stands the event which forms at once the principal warrant and the principal element of their preaching,—the Resurrection of the Lord. The *mode* of this event, an event that passes the bounds of ordinary human experience, and is concerned with the mystery of life and death, can never be comprehended. The fact is attested on grounds equally strong with those which support the testimony of the Apostles respecting the whole life of Jesus. There are considerations which corroborate in a remarkable manner this part of their testimony. That they, with one accord, proclaimed the fact of the Resurrection, and this from the very date of its alleged occurrence, is beyond doubt. Here, in agreement with the Gospels, Paul comes forward as an independent witness. In the year 58, he wrote from Ephesus his First Epistle to the Church at Corinth. It appears from this Letter that some Christians had called in question the doctrine of the resurrection, not the fact of the resurrection of Jesus, but the resurrection of believers generally. They may have been offended by a materialistic representation, which Paul makes it a part of his business to controvert, that the same flesh and blood that belongs to us on earth is to be revived and restored. However this may have been, Paul lays at the foundation of his reasoning the fact of the Resurrection

of Jesus. He recalls the testimony which he had given them as to this central fact of the Christian faith.[1] He sets down in order a series of interviews of the risen Jesus with the Apostles and other Disciples; and this careful statement shows the importance which he attached to the proofs in question, and how strictly he had investigated them. He says that Christ died and was buried, and that on the third day afterwards, He rose from the dead; that He was seen by Peter, then by the Twelve—a general designation of the body of Apostles, although Judas was no longer of the number;—that He was then seen simultaneously by more than five hundred disciples, whether in Jerusalem or Galilee he does not say; then by James, by whom is meant, in all probability, the brother of Jesus; and again by the Apostles collectively. Last of all He was seen by Paul himself; the reference being, undoubtedly to his conversion. There is no reason to think that in either of these instances, not even in the appearance of Jesus to himself, the Apostle intends to describe a vision, in distinction from an actual bodily appearance. It is not a mental perception, but visual perception by the organ of sight, that the Apostle means to affirm. The statement that He was seen by five hundred at once is introduced as tending to show that there was no hallucination. It is safe to say that Paul learned these facts from the Apostles themselves. In A. D. 38, three years after his conversion, he had spent a fortnight with Peter at Jerusalem.[2] Other Apostles and immediate disciples of Jesus were known to him personally. Nothing need be said on the question whether the Apostles affirmed the Resurrection of Jesus from the date of this supposed event. It is held by considerate inquirers of all schools that their faith in the Resurrec-

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3.

[2] Gal. i. 18.

tion was the fountain of all their zeal, the one chief source of their courage and activity.[1] From this faith, as a prime condition, historical Christianity takes its start and derives its life. The psychological conditions of such a faith, if the fact to which it was attached is left out, are wanting. How could the Disciples, after the appalling scenes of the crucifixion, when they dispersed and fled, and in the two days and nights that followed, "when they mourned and wept" over the wreck of their hopes,[2]—how could they, in the midst of their despondency, imagine a Resurrection, and not only recover their courage, but find it augmented a thousand-fold? To say the least, the exalted anticipations required to counteract the disappointment and sorrow which rolled heavily upon them, could only arise from the vivid recollection of His miraculous works while He had been with them. But if these miraculous works were real, then there is no antecedent improbability in the fact of His own Resurrection.[3] The entire spiritual life of the disciples from that

[1] See Baur, *Gesch. d. drei ersten Jahrhh.*, pp 39, 40. [2] Mark xvi. 10.

[3] It is true that it was popularly believed that a prophet might come back to the earth. John the Baptist was supposed by some to be Elijah. Jesus was taken for Elijah, or Jeremiah, or some other prophet, who had been restored to life. But in both cases there was a great objective phenomenon, the actual prophetic work of John, and of Jesus, which found in this belief an explanation. Herod Antipas, under the excitement of remorse, thought that John the Baptist might have been raised from the dead. But it was the report of the miracles wrought by Jesus, an objective fact which demanded explanation, that suggested to his mind this solution. These instances of superstition, if such they are to be called, furnish no parallel to the faith of the Disciples in the Resurrection of Jesus. Nor does Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, whether the incident mentioned be considered to be subjective, or objective, militate, when the passage is rightly considered, against testimony such as the Evangelists and the Apostle Paul present respecting the great central fact on which their faith in Christ depended. See Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 757 n.

epoch onward, their restored communion with the Lord, which had been broken by His death, their conception of Him as delivered from the limits of sense and space, and consequently the whole subsequent history of Christianity, presuppose the fact to which all these results are due.

Of the character of the manifestations of Jesus after the Resurrection, two things are evident from the Gospel records. The first is that they were objectively real, being made to so many persons, on various occasions, and so tested by the eye, the ear, and the touch, that illusion is precluded. The second is that these manifestations were to the disciples alone. The capacity of the material organism to be transformed into a perfect vehicle of the spirit, a deeper knowledge of the mysterious essence of matter and life might enable us to discern. It may be that in the interval from the morning when the risen Jesus first appeared to the Disciples, to the moment of His final separation from their sight, this change was in the process of fulfillment.

What was the essence of the doctrine which the Apostles proclaimed in their preaching? In answering this question, much aid may be derived from the Epistles; yet it must not be forgotten that they were written not to make converts, but to edify converts already made. In the book of Acts, however, we have examples of addresses made to unbelievers. A distinction was necessarily made between the teaching directed to the Jews, and the appeals made to the heathen, who had not been prepared for Christianity by a training under the Old Testament religion. The truth which, first of all, the Apostles uttered in the ears of their Jewish countrymen was that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, or Messiah,[1] They were called upon to

[1] On this subject, see Matt. xvi. 16-18, John i. 49 50; iv. 25, 26, 29, 39, xi. 26, 27, vi. 69, vii. 31, x. 24-26, xi. 24-26, xi. 27, 41, 42, 45, 47,

believe in Him; that is, believe that He was in truth the Saviour and King whom the Prophets had predicted.[1] Since the principal obstacle to faith was the fact of the crucifixion, it was necessary to show that the Prophets had foretold the sufferings and death of the Messiah.[2] Thus the idea of a vicarious death on behalf of His people entered into the Apostolic doctrine respecting Christ, and found a sanction in His own teachings.[3] The positive proof that Jesus was the Messiah was mainly in His works, and the spirit in which they were wrought, and, more than all, in His Resurrection from the grave.[4] This was a great and conclusive attestation rendered by God Himself to the claims of Jesus. Thus the preaching of the Apostles resolved itself, to a great extent, into the testimony which they had to give to facts respecting Jesus, which they had witnessed. But if Jesus was the Messiah, the rejection of Him, and the destruction of Him "by cruel hands," revealed and enhanced the sin of the nation whose act it was. Hence the call to repentance was re-enforced by this new and overwhelming evidence of the necessity of it.[5] And this call was attended with the added declaration that He who had been unjustly slain was to return to judge the world.[6] It is obvious that the faith in Jesus, which the Apostles called for as the condition of salvation, was an acknowledgment from the heart, and was sufficiently deep and sincere to move the believer openly to make profession of his faith, to ally himself to the persecuted cause of Christ, and to submit to all the sacrifices which were in-

48, xx. 30, 31, 1 John v. 1, Acts ii. 36, 41, viii. 12, 37, ix. 20, 22, x. 42, 43, xvii. 2-4, xviii. 4-6, 11, xviii. 27, 28.

[1] Acts v. 31.

[2] Acts iii. 18, 24, iv. 10, 33, viii. 28-35, xxvi. 22.

[3] Matt. xx. 28; xxvi. 38; John i. 29, iii. 14, vi. 51, x. 11, xvii. 19.

[4] Acts ii. 32, 33, 36; iii. 14, 26.

[5] Acts ii. 22, 23, 37, 38; iii. 14, 15, 17, 19.

[6] Acts x. 42.

volved in such a step.[1] It was impossible that this faith should not produce the greatest change in the general temper of heart. To believe in Christ was to own Him as the Lord and Guide. His precepts were accepted as the law of life. Especially did the love, which He had manifested even to enemies, in His own death, stand as the ideal of excellence. The forgiveness of sin, which the Apostles offered in His name, while it inspired the believer with gratitude to Heaven, was the most powerful incentive to the cultivation of kind and charitable feelings towards mankind.

When the Apostles went to the Gentiles, they could not build upon familiar Jewish conceptions. They must find or create an equivalent for them upon heathen ground. They had to lay a foundation in the natural intuitions and conscious necessities of the human soul, apart from all special revelation. They asserted monotheism, and affirmed that God is a Spirit; and they were aided in this preliminary work by that growing tendency to monotheism in the heathen mind, which has been pointed out on preceding pages, and by the influence which the Jewish religion had exerted beyond the circle of its professed adherents. From the exalted attributes of God they inferred the folly and criminality of idolatrous worship.[2] The fact of sin and guilt, and the prospect of judgment, were more or less vividly recognized by the general conscience. Earnest discourse upon righteousness, temperance, or the government of the appetites, and accountableness to God, awakened fear in the minds of profligate men.[3] The fundamental ideas which made up the Jewish and Christian conception of the Messiah were capable of being made intelligible to the heathen mind. The story of Jesus and of the Resurrection might strike there a responsive chord. The doctrine of

[1] Acts viii. 37. [2] Acts xiv. 15, xvii. 25, 29. [3] Acts xxiv. 25.

the influence of the Holy Spirit seldom excited repugnance, or skepticism, among the heathen. The idea of a possible divine influence upon the human soul was already familiar to them.

In the case of the Apostle Paul, we know that he varied his instruction according to the mental and moral condition of his hearers. The discourse which he delivered on Mars Hill was not repeated in every heathen town. In teaching the Corinthians, he had shunned all rhetorical decoration, and abstained from philosophical disquisition.[1] He had made prominent the great facts of Christianity, a Redeemer crucified, and His resurrection from the dead. He was careful to add, however, that beyond this rudimental teaching, there was a philosophy (*σοφία*), or theology, which was adapted to Christians more mature in the experience of the new life.[2] Yet this Christian philosophy differed from the Greek systems, first, as relating to the method of salvation through Christ, and secondly, as being spiritual,—as resting upon the illumination which is kindled in the mind by the Spirit of God.[3] Of this higher range of teaching the Epistle to the Romans may be an example. Elsewhere, Paul recognizes the possibility of differing systems of ethics and theology, which assume to rest upon the one foundation—Jesus Christ. Some of these superstructures are solid and enduring; others are unsubstantial, and will perish. But the authors of them, provided they do not seek to subvert the foundation, may hope to be saved.[4]

The conception of the person of Christ, which formed itself in the minds of the Apostles, was the effect of that impression which he had made upon them by His entire

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 1-6.
[2] 1 Cor. ii. 1, 6, cf. iii. 1, 2.
[3] 1 Cor. ii. 7-16.
[4] 1 Cor. iii. 11-16.

life, teaching, and miracles, and of specific declarations made by Himself. In the Synoptical Gospels, He stands above even the angelic creation, in a relation to God which involves the most intimate mutual knowledge.[1] He is to judge the world, to appoint the lot of every individual in all the generations of mankind. In Paul and John—Paul as well as John—His pre-existence, and the Incarnation, are explicitly set forth.[2]

In the writings of Paul, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the death and ascension of Jesus are shown to involve the catholic and spiritual character of His kingdom. No distinctions or prerogatives of a carnal nature can belong to it.[3] Believers are taken up into the fellowship of that celestial life which He now leads.[4] The Apostle no longer knows "Christ after the flesh" (*κατὰ σάρκα*), as the member of one nation, as a Hebrew.[5] The abolition of Judaic particularism, and the impartial freedom of the Christian brotherhood, is the legitimate consequence of the heavenly and glorified life that belongs to Jesus. Who can doubt that these views give the real import of the work of Christ, and were inspired by the same Spirit from whom the whole Christian revelation proceeds?

The number of disciples, at the death of Christ, as we have seen from the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6), exceeded five hundred; of whom there were about one hundred and twenty permanently resident at Jerusalem (Acts i. 15). Of the subsequent history of most of the Apostles we have scanty knowledge. James, the brother of John, was put

[1] Matt. xxv. 31, Mark viii. 38, Luke ix. 26, Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22. On this subject see Dorner, *Gesch. d. Lehre v. d. Person Christ.*, I. p. 67 seq.

[2] John i. 1-5, viii. 58, xvii. 5, 24, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Phil. ii. 6, 7, 2 Cor. viii. 9.

[3] Eph. ii. 13-20. [4] Phil. iii. 20. [5] 2 Cor. v. 16.

to death by Herod Agrippa I., at the Passover in the year 44. Another James, the son of Alpheus, one of the Twelve, still survived; and a third James, the brother of Christ,[1] comes forward, exercising the essential functions of an Apostle. The activity of Peter, as a missionary to the Jews, and in the guidance of the Jewish Christians, extended over a wide sphere. In the conversion of his countrymen he had signal success (Gal. ii. 8). But of the particulars of his career, very little is known. In the year 52 he is at Jerusalem, on the occasion of the Apostolic conference. Subsequently we find him at Antioch in conjunction with Paul (Gal. ii. 11 seq.). His first Epistle is written from Babylon,[2] which probably means, not Rome, the mystic Babylon of the Apocalypse, but the ancient city on the banks of the Euphrates. In that region Jews were very numerous, and it is natural that the leading Apostle to the Jews should be found among them. Whether he had visited the Christians of Asia Minor, to whom his Epistle is directed,[3] is uncertain. It became an established tradition that he perished as a martyr at Rome. That he died as a martyr seems evident from John xxi. 18, 19. The first authority in support of the belief that he died at Rome, is Dionysius of Corinth, in an Epistle to the Romans, written about A. D. 170,[4] who says that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom there at about the same time. Irenæus (A. D. 176 or 177) refers to the preaching of both of these Apostles at Rome, without speaking of the mode and time of their death.[5]

The Roman writer Caius[6] (about A. D. 200), and Tertullian[7] state that Rome was the place of Peter's martyrdom. Much earlier than either of these writers, Clement

[1] See above, p. 424.
[2] 1 Peter v. 13.
[3] 1 Peter i. 1.
[4] Euseb. *H. E.*, ii. 25.
[5] Adv. Hær., III. i. 1, III. iii. 2.
[6] Euseb. ii. 25.
[7] De Præscript. Hæret., c. 36.

of Rome,[1] and even Ignatius,[2] refer to the martyrdom of Peter, but do not speak of the place where it occurred. Since the tradition that he died at Rome antedates the hierarchical pretensions of the Roman See which are connected with Peter, and since there is no other tradition as to the mode or place of his death, the recollection of which would hardly die out, we may accept the martyrdom at Rome as a probable fact.

Not far from the time of the death of Paul, as the events were ripening which brought on the Jewish War and the destruction of Jerusalem, the Apostle John took up his residence in Asia Minor, where he lived until near the close of the century, and was buried at Ephesus.[3] John was not the only one of the Twelve who transferred his abode to this region. Philip spent his last days at Hierapolis in Phrygia, and there, according to Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus (about A. D. 190), he died.[4]

Among the uncertain traditions, must be placed the connection of Mark, the companion of Paul and Barnabas, and of Peter, with the founding of the Church at Alexandria, and of Thomas with the establishment of ancient churches in India; although the tradition in both cases is less weakly supported than various other legends of Apostolic labors.[5]

Our information is most full as to the career of the Apostle to the Gentiles. There were many journeys, labors, and sufferings, however, in the course of his missionary life, of which there is no record in the book of

[1] Epist. i. c. 5.
[2] Ep. ad Rom., c. 4.
[3] See above, p. 327 seq.
[4] Euseb. *H. E.*, v. 24. cf. iii. 31.
[5] For a summary of these traditions, see the Article of Lipsius, *Acts of the Apostles (Apocryphal)*, in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. The legends respecting Thomas, as the Apostle of the East, are reviewed in the recent work of W. Germann, *Die Thomaschristen* (1877) pp. 11–48.

Acts, but to which he refers in general terms in his own Epistles. The life of Paul illustrates the habit which belonged to the first preachers of the Gospel generally, of making the large cities the principal theatre of their efforts for the promulgation of the new faith. In these, the synagogues not unfrequently opened their doors to the preachers of Jewish extraction, on their first arrival; in the thronging population of cities, it was likely that there would be more minds prepared to lend a favoring ear to their message; the obstacles from differences of language were less; and commercial intercourse facilitated the spread of the good seed that was scattered in the great marts of trade. It is an interesting, but not a surprising fact, that the circumstances of the first planting of Christianity in places which were later among its most powerful seats, including Rome and Carthage, are not known. Visitors to Jerusalem at the great Festivals, mechanics who changed their abode from place to place, and commercial travellers, might carry to their homes the faith which they had elsewhere received, and form the nucleus of new Christian communities. The Gospel doctrine was transported from place to place, as seeds are blown from the trees and wafted abroad.

The legends which connect Paul with the establishment of Christianity in Arabia, of which we have distinct traces after the beginning of the third century, rest on no better foundation than the probability that he would be neither idle nor unsuccessful during the interval that followed his conversion, prior to his return to Damascus. At Damascus his labors were of short continuance. Larger and more effective, we cannot doubt, were his efforts in his native city of Tarsus, the principal town of Cilicia, lying on a broad and fertile plain, upon the banks of the Cydnus; "no mean city," but the centre of a flourishing trade, and in the early period of the Empire, distinguished for its in-

tellectual culture and its schools of philosophy.[1] Antioch, the metropolis, in a sense, of Gentile Christianity, the magnificent and populous city which Seleucus Nicator had built upon the shores of the Orontes, about fifteen miles from the coast, the chief of the Greek cities in Syria in luxury and vice, as well as in numbers and wealth, was the head-quarters of the Apostle for a considerable period, and the point whence his missionary journeys radiated. The first of these journeys, undertaken (about A. D. 45), with Barnabas for a companion, and Mark, a cousin of Barnabas (Col. iv. 10), as an associate for a part of the way, carried the Apostle, first to Salamis on the eastern coast of Cyprus, and across that island to Paphos, where Sergius Paulus, the Proconsul, was converted, whose office and character are described by Luke with an accuracy which attests his knowledge and fidelity as an historian.[2] From Paphos, they sailed to Attalia, on the southern coast of Pamphylia, and near Perga; from Perga they moved northward to Antioch in Pisidia, and from there eastward as far as Lystra and Derbe in Lycaonia. Thence, retracing their course, they came back to

[1] The determination of the date of Paul's conversion depends upon the time fixed for the rule of Aretas over Damascus (2 Cor. xi. 32). But this last point cannot be ascertained with certainty. If, with Meyer and others, we suppose Paul's escape from Damascus to have been in A. D. 38, his conversion took place A. D. 35 (Gal. i. 18), about four years after the crucifixion of Jesus (A. D. 31). His labors at Antioch probably began A. D. 43. The famine in the time of Claudius (Acts xi. 27, seq.) was in the next year (A. D. 44). It would appear, therefore, that immediately after his escape from Damascus and his first visit to Jerusalem, when he was with Peter for a fortnight (Gal. i. 18), he spent several years in Apostolic work in Cilicia and Syria, making Tarsus the centre of operations. In this interval, probably, occurred most of the sufferings mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 24–26—two scourgings by Roman authorities, five by Jewish, and three shipwrecks. See Howson's *Life of St. Paul*, ii. 665.

[2] Acts xiii. 6–13. See Howson's *Life of St. Paul*, i. 176, 177.

Attalia, where they took ship directly for Antioch. This was the first great incursion of the Apostle into the domain of heathenism, and occupied, it would seem, several years. It was followed very soon (A. D. 52) by his visit to Jerusalem, to attend the Apostolic Conference (Acts xv.; Gal. ii. 1). In his second missionary journey (A. D. 52)—when he was accompanied by Silas, and joined by Timothy at Lystra—having revisited his converts in eastern Asia Minor, he passed through Galatia and Phrygia, still engaged in founding churches, and with the design, first of advancing through Mysia to the sea-coast, and then, when he was moved to give up this plan, of travelling northward into Bithynia. Prevented, likewise, by an inward monition from carrying out this intention, he came to Troas. There, as the effect of a vision, he resolved to cross over to Europe. Touching at Samothrace, he landed at Neapolis. Proceeding thence to Philippi, he planted a Church which was peculiarly devoted to him, and to which he was afterwards tenderly attached. Following the course of the great Roman road which connected the north of the Ægean with the capital of the Empire, he passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, the most important city in Macedonia, the metropolis of the Province, and a place which reaped a rich harvest both from its maritime commerce and its trade with the interior. After tarrying there for a while, he was driven, with Silas, to leave the town, on account of the hostility of the Jews. Favorably received at Berea by both Jews and Greeks, he was, also, compelled by disturbances excited through Jewish emissaries from Thessalonica, to depart from that place. We next find him at Athens, a city whose chief treasure was now the recollection of its former glories; which had suffered from the vengeance of Sulla; whose walls were now leveled to the ground, but

which was still renowned as a seat of art, letters, and philosophy, drawing pupils of distinction from Rome itself. The intellectual vivacity and restless curiosity of its people are pictured in the narrative by Luke of the Apostle's visit. It was at Corinth, which he reached A. D. 53, that Paul sojourned for the longest time. Here occurred his interview with the Proconsul Gallio, the brother of the philosopher Seneca. From Corinth were written, it is probable, his two Epistles to the Thessalonian converts, the one not long after the other, and the first not many months after his stay in Thessalonica. Corinth had been raised from its ruins by the magnanimity and wisdom of Julius Cæsar, and was the chief city of Achaia. Its unrivalled advantages of situation, between two seas, had rapidly built up its fortunes, so that it was now a rich and populous, as well as a luxurious and dissolute city. The church which was founded here consisted mainly of Gentiles. At Corinth, Paul remained for about a year and a half. From the Isthmus he sailed to Ephesus; but making only a brief stay there, he resumed his voyage, and returned to Antioch by way of Cæsarea and Jerusalem. Soon after (A. D. 55), he entered on his third great missionary journey. Taking the westward route, by land from Antioch, he traversed Asia Minor, going over "all the country of Galatia and Phrygia," and, proceeding thence to Ephesus, began his residence there, which was protracted, with occasional absences, for upwards of two years, (A. D. 56–58). Under the auspices of Augustus, Ephesus had risen from its decline, had become a great commercial mart, parallel in importance with Corinth, and was the capital of the province of Asia, a province that was said to include within its limits not less than five hundred cities. It was from Ephesus, probably, that he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, and the First Epistle to the Corinthians; while

in Macedonia, after he had left Ephesus, he probably wrote, from Philippi, the Second Epistle to the same Church. After journeying as far to the West, perhaps, as the borders of Illyricum, he came down into Greece, and remained with the churches there three months. There he indited his Epistle to the Romans. Passing through Macedonia, he sailed from Philippi, and touching first at Troas, and then at Miletus, where he bade farewell to the elders of the Church of Ephesus, which had been to him the centre of prolonged labors and arduous conflicts, he pursued his voyage to Cæsarea, and reached Jerusalem A. D. 59. Rescued from the mob of Jewish malignants, the Apostle remained for two years in the custody of the Roman procurators at Cæsarea (A. D. 59–61), when his appeal to Cæsar enabled him to fulfil his long cherished intention "to see Rome," and to bear witness to the Gospel in the imperial city itself. After suffering shipwreck on the coast of Malta, he landed at Puteoli, where there were brethren to greet him; and at Appii Forum, and then at the Three Taverns, he was met by deputations of Christian disciples from Rome, who had doubtless been informed from Puteoli of his approach. The Church at Rome had grown up, partly, it is probable, as the result of labors of converts of his own, and partly by other agencies. His Epistle, written three years before, indicates that it consisted partly of heathen converts, and partly of Jewish Christians. His Epistles which were written during this period of imprisonment, show that a Judaizing faction was not wanting to cavil at his teaching, and disparage his authority.[1] Yet it appears that the Roman Church as a body regarded him with loyal sympathy. That church, gathered mostly from the obscure ranks of society, a majority of its members being, also, it is probable, Greeks, was no doubt numerous.

[1] See above, p. 492.

A portion of the catacombs, the earliest Christian burial-places, are known by their structure and style of decoration to belong to the first century. A passage of doubtful import in Suetonius adverts to tumults among the Jews, in which "Christus" was the ringleader.[1] If there is reason to think that this is a confused report of disturbances among the Jews pertaining to Christus, or the Messiah, we still cannot be sure that the name and claims of Jesus were involved in these disputes. But the testimony of Tacitus, whom there is no sufficient reason for charging with a mistake here, proves that in the year 64, when the Neronian persecution broke out, the Christians formed a large body.

The studied reserve of the Jewish elders whom Paul called to an interview with him soon after his arrival, or, what is less likely, their imperfect knowledge of a sect that had sprung up among their numerous countrymen in the midst of the vast city, explains the tone which they assumed (Acts xxviii. 21, 22). It is not impossible that among the Christian converts in the early days of the Roman Church there was, here and there, an individual of rank. Pomponia Græcina, a lady of distinction whose story is told by Tacitus,[2] has been thought by some to have been one of those charged (A. D. 57) with embracing "a foreign superstition,"—a charge which implied the abandonment of the national worship. She was tried, according to custom, by her husband, Plautius, in the presence of her kindred, and was acquitted. She lived to a great age, apparently in sorrow, and wearing "no habit but that of mourning." This was attributed to grief for the fate of Julia, the daughter of Drusus, who was put to death by Messalina fourteen years before the accusation was brought. But this alone would not account for the charge of forsaking the Roman religion;

[1] Claudius, xxv.

[2] Annal. xiii. 32.

and the supposition that she was a Christian, and that her mode of life grew out of her religious faith, is certainly quite probable.

For two years (A. D. 62–64) the Apostle remained under the surveillance of the Prætorian Guard. Though his wrist was bound by a coupling-chain to the wrist of the soldier who was put with him to prevent his escape, he was yet permitted to dwell in his own hired rooms, to receive all who wished to see him, and to prosecute his Apostolic work. Among the Prætorian regiments, from which his guards, who of course relieved one another, were drawn, and among the "members of Cæsar's household," he won converts to the Christian faith. The "household of Cæsar" embraced the numerous slaves and freedmen, among whom were many Jews, as well as Greeks, who were attached to the imperial family.[1] The expression does not imply, therefore, that these converts were persons of distinction, although employment in the domestic service of the emperor, even in a menial capacity, might confer privileges that would be prized. Several Roman men and women of high rank have been enrolled, on insufficient grounds, among the early believers in Christianity. But, towards the close of the century, two names appear, which are known to be entitled to a place among them. Flavius Clemens, a cousin of Domitian, and a former consul, and his wife Flavia Domitilla, were accused of being Christians.[2] He was put to death, and his wife was banished. There is even reason to conclude that one of the early Christian burial places, the "cemetery of Domitilla," the site of which has recently been discovered,

[1] See Friedländer, i. 75-126 (4th ed.); Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 169 seq.

[2] Suetonius, *Domitian*, xv., Dion Cass., lxvii. 14, Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii. 20, cf. Lardner, *Testimony of Ancient Heathens*, CXXVII. iii., c. VIII. iv.,

was on ground granted by this lady to her fellow believers.[1]

There is every reason to conclude that Paul's preaching, even under the disadvantages that belonged to his situation as a captive, was attended with marked success. His care for all his churches was not intermitted. At Rome, in this period, were written the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, to the Philippians, and to Philemon. Of what followed this period in the life of Paul, we have no knowledge. Luke's narrative implies, that at the expiration of two years some event of an important character occurred. The Pastoral Epistles—1st and 2d Timothy, and Titus—imply a release from the first imprisonment. A second imprisonment terminated in his martyrdom at Rome, in the year 67 or 68. It has been thought that in the interval between the two imprisonments, he not only visited Macedonia, and twice visited Asia Minor, but also made a journey to Spain. For the fact of a journey to Spain, the proof is chiefly derived from the expression of a wish or purpose on his part to go there, coupled with a passage of Clement of Rome where the Apostle is described as having carried the Gospel to the bounds of the West.[2]

The world-wide activity of the Apostle Paul, extending through a period of thirty years, beginning at a time when

Merivale, *History of the Romans*, vii. 126, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 22. The charge of "Atheism" against Clement, united with that of living according to Jewish customs, proves him to have been a Christian. Suetonius calls him a man of "contemptible indolence" (contemtissimæ inertiæ). Charges of this sort were often made against Christians, owing to their partial withdrawal from social and public life.

[1] For an account of the investigations of de Rossi, on this point, see Lightfoot, *Clement: an Appendix*, etc., p. 257 seq.

[2] Epist. ad. Cor., c. 5 (*ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως*). The choice is between the supposition that Clement puts himself in the place of his readers, and refers (rhetorically) to Rome, and the reference to Spain. Dr. Lightfoot adopts the latter interpretation, in his ed. of Clement, pp. 5, 6.

he was in the full vigor of life, and not terminating until he had become "Paul the aged," was the prime means of establishing the Christian religion in Europe, not to speak of the effect of his untiring labors in the whole region between the Syrian capital and the coast of the Ægean.

Being a Roman citizen, he suffered death, in all probability, by decapitation; and the sentence was executed, it is likely, outside of the gate upon the road leading to Ostia. The Apostle was ready to die; for what Cicero says of Cæsar was true, in a far higher sense of the terms, of Paul: his soul glowed with the desire of immortality—"semper immortalitatis amore flagravit."[1]

The Neronian persecution makes an epoch in the early history of the progress of Christianity. Agrippina, the mother of Nero, became, after the death of her first husband, the wife of Claudius. Bent upon gaining power for herself and for her son, and having no scruple as to the means, she availed herself of the help of Locusta, a professional poisoner, and of Xenophon, the physician of the Emperor, to destroy him by poisons mixed in a dish of mushrooms, which he ate at the table, when she was present.[2] The preparations had been so made that Nero, then at the age of seventeen (A. D. 54), was saluted as Emperor by the Prætorian guards, to whom he was presented by Burrus, their leader, and by the Senate, to the exclusion of the younger Brittanicus, the son of Claudius by a former wife. With such a mother as Nero had, and considering the enervating luxury and moral pollution in which he was immersed from early childhood, it is probable that his tutor, the Philosopher Seneca, who knew how in his own conduct to abate something from the rigor of the Stoic precepts, did what was practicable to be done to curb the sensual and cruel nature of his pupil. Certain it is that as long as his

[1] Pro Marcello, ix.

[2] Tacitus, *Annal.*, xii. 66, 67.

influence and that of Burrus were predominant, Nero abstained from those excesses of violence and folly which have rendered his name infamous. The first five years of his reign—"the quinquennium"—were, as a whole, honorably distinguished from the eight or nine years that followed. When, in the early days of his power, the warrant for the execution of a criminal was brought to him to sign, he regretted that he had ever learned to write, so averse did he profess to be to the shedding of blood.[1] His guardians adroitly contrived to keep Agrippina back from actually sharing in the imperial honors and administration, to which she arrogantly aspired. He was betrothed to Octavia, his half-sister, but he made Acte, a Greek freed-woman, his mistress; and he was indulged in this matter by Seneca and Burrus, partly as a means of counteracting the pernicious influence of his mother. The first great crime of Nero was the murder of the innocent Brittanicus, whom he dreaded as one whom his enemies, and possibly his mother, might bring forward as a rival, and make the instrument of supplanting him. Even in the early part of his reign, one of his amusements was to roam the streets at night, with boon companions, disguised, like himself, and to engage in frays with shop-keepers by endeavoring to snatch their goods. Montanus, a Senator, who, not knowing his rank, struck him in one of these excursions, and then recognized him, was ordered to kill himself.[2] When he became enamored of a woman famous for her beauty, Poppæa Sabina, her husband, Otho, was sent away to the government of Lusitania. False accusations of unfaithfulness were made a pretext for putting Octavia to death (A. D. 62). Poppæa became Nero's wife, but she, too, was destined to perish from the effect of a brutal kick of her husband when she was with child (A. D. 65). Before this time, Agrippina, after

[1] Suetonius, *Nero*, x.

[2] Tacitus, *Annal.*, xiii. 25.

various unsuccessful efforts had been made to destroy her, which were foiled by her vigilance, was despatched by the command of her son (A. D. 59). This was prior to Paul's first arrival in Rome. Burrus, who was then still in power, was another victim of Nero's unbridled cruelty and jealousy. Seneca, at a later day, received the missive to die, which the tyrant so often sent to those of whom he would be rid, and which the Philosopher obeyed by opening his veins, according to the prevalent custom of the time. His age compelled him to accelerate the sluggish flow of his blood by a warm bath. Nero from childhood manifested a passion for singing, and for playing upon musical instruments. Had he been born in an inferior station, he would have acquired a moderate repute as an artist. Nothing delighted him so much as the applause so easily won for his musical performances; and the care and culture of his naturally husky voice was in his eyes a matter of greater moment than the most serious affairs of state. His eagerness to figure as a charioteer led him, early in his reign, to construct a circus in his own gardens in the Vatican, where he could display his skill as a coachman to a throng of invited spectators. At length he came forward on the stage, in his own palace, as an actor in the new festival which he established under the name of the Juvenalia. This was the prelude to his appearance in the theatre before the populace, lyre in hand, to compete for their applause. Senators of highest rank, and matrons of noble descent, were induced, by his example and commands, to appear in public as dancers and play-actors. The theatre and circus more and more engrossed his attention. He squandered the treasures that were gathered from the provinces, in expensive shows of this sort, and made in connection with them the most profuse distribution of presents.

On the 19th of July, A. D. 64, the great fire broke out

at Rome, which gave occasion for the persecution of the Christians. It began in the neighborhood of the Circus, between the Palatine and Cælian hills, and after raging for six days, it burst forth anew in a quarter which had escaped the first conflagration, and then spread with unabated fury for three days longer. Not less than one-third of the city was laid in ashes. Some of the most venerable historic monuments, temples and shrines of the divinities, and countless precious works of art, were swept away by the torrent of flame. Many lives were lost, and multitudes of survivors were rendered houseless and destitute of every thing. When the fire began, Nero was at Antium. When his own palace was threatened, he came to the city, and showed energy and zeal in providing places of temporary refuge for the people whose dwellings were consumed. Nero was himself suspected of having set the city on fire. The story was started that from the towers of his villa he sang from Homer, to the accompaniment of his own lyre, "the Sack of Troy." The conflagration had broken out, in the second instance, in the vicinity of the gardens of his creature, Tigellinus. It was thought that the Emperor wished to rebuild the city in a nobler style, and even to call it by his own name; and, especially as religious edifices could not be demolished without sacrilege, that he resorted to this method of clearing the ground for his new erections. The subsequent extension of his own mansion, the Golden Palace, furnished an additional ground for giving credence to the charge. It is given as a fact by Suetonius, and mentioned more cautiously by Tacitus as a popular belief. It is, however, more commonly discredited by modern writers.[1] Of this we are assured by Tacitus, that an anxiety to repel the imputation of being the author of all this

[1] See the arguments of H. Schiller, *Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserreichs unter d. Regierung d. Nero*, p. 432 seq.

devastation was what led to Nero's persecution of the Christians, on whom he sought to roll the burden of guilt which might otherwise rest on himself. Tacitus says:—

"But not all the relief that could come from man, nor the bounties of the Prince, nor the atonements offered to the gods, relieved Nero from the infamy of being believed to have ordered the conflagration. Therefore, in order to suppress the rumor, he falsely charged with the guilt (subdidit reos), and punished with the most exquisite tortures, those persons who, hated for their crimes, were commonly called Christians. The founder of that name, had been put to death by the Procurator, Pontius Pilate, in the reign of Tiberius; but the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again, not only through Judea, the source of this evil, but in the city [of Rome] itself, whither all things vile and shameful flow from all quarters, and are encouraged. Accordingly, first, those were seized who confessed [that they were Christians]; next, on their information a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of making the conflagration, as of hating the human race [odio humani generis]. And in their deaths they were made the subjects of sport, for they were covered with the hides of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined, were burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero had offered his own gardens for this exhibition, and also exhibited a game of the circus, sometimes mingling in the crowd in the dress of a charioteer, and sometimes standing in his chariot. Whence a feeling of compassion arose towards the sufferers, though guilty, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but as victims to the ferocity of one man."[1]

That Tacitus was not mistaken as to the class of persons who were thus tormented for the amusement of the populace, that they were Christians and not Jews, cannot reasonably be doubted.[2] He was well acquainted with the distinction between Christians and Jews, and his language is explicit. Suetonius, also, tells us that the Christians were persecuted by Nero.[3] It may seem singular that Chris-

[1] Annal., xv. 44.

[2] It is questioned, without sufficient reason, by Gibbon, Ch. xvi.

[3] Nero, 16. Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum, superstitionis novæ et maleficæ.

tians, in distinction from Jews, should have been singled out by Nero when he looked about for objects on which to divert the wrath of the people, since the Jews were far more numerous and equally odious. This consideration has led to the conjecture that it was the Jews who made the false accusation against the Christians, either to save themselves from being the victims of the popular vengeance, or merely out of animosity against the sect which they detested.[1] The orientals dwelt in large numbers in the quarter where the fire broke out, and suspicion might easily light upon them. But the conjecture which attributes the destruction of the Christians to false information emanating from the Jews rests upon no positive evidence. The Christians had become numerous enough, as the language of Tacitus implies, even if there be some exaggeration in the "ingens multitudo," to draw to themselves the attention of the Roman authorities. The epithets of reprobation which the Roman historians attached to the innocent sufferers are accounted for by the feeling with which they would naturally regard a sect that paid no homage to the Roman divinities, and renounced every national faith,—a sect composed, too, for the most part, of foreigners and obscure persons. But the terms employed by Tacitus and Suetonius suggest that the common charges which were brought by the heathen against the Christians, of immorality and unnatural crimes, had reached their ears and were credulously accepted. The alleged misanthropy, or enmity to mankind, which made the people willing to see the Christians subjected to torment for offences which they had not committed, consisted in that separation from heathen worship, and heathen vices and amusements,

[1] So, Merivale, *History of the Romans*, vi. 222; Von Reumont, *Gesch. d. Stadt Rom.*, vol. i. See, also, Renan, *L'Antechrist*, 159 seq., Schiller, *Gesch. d. Nero*, p. 436.

which formed a conspicuous and obnoxious characteristic of the disciples of the new faith.

The page which we have cited from Tacitus lifts the veil, for a moment, upon the Church in the capital. For the first time Christianity is smitten by the strong hand of the Roman imperial power. Up to this time, persecution had been generally incited by Jews, in their anger against the apostles of what they considered a heresy. On various occasions, it was the Roman authorities who intervened for their protection, and for the preservation of order. Disputes between Christians and Jews had been looked upon by Roman officials with disdain as wrangles among factions of the same religion.[1] But now the Christians stand out as a separate body, no longer protected by the ægis which Roman feeling and Roman policy extended over the religion professed by a nation, and exposed, from the peculiarities of their faith, to a disgust and animosity such as other systems of worship could not in an equal degree evoke. How far the cruelty of Nero led to the persecution of Christians in the provinces, is a controverted point.[2] It was not until about the close of the century, in the reign of Trajan, that Christianity was formally placed under the ban of the law. The persecution of Domitian, like that of Nero, may be considered as springing from the selfishness and passion of an individual, rather than from the settled policy of the State.

There is an allusion to the Neronian persecution in the oldest Christian writing after the Apostles, the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, which was written,

[1] E. g., see Acts xviii. 17, xxiii. 29, xxv. 18, 19.

[2] That this persecution extended to the provinces is maintained by Ewald, *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, vi. 628 seq. This belief is favored by passages in the Apocalypse. See, also, Renan, *Antechrist*, p. 183 seq. On the other side, see H. Schiller, *Gesch. d. röm Kaiserreichs unter d. Regierung d. Nero*, p. 436 seq.

there is good reason to believe, just at the close of Domitian's reign, A. D. 96 or 97. The "sudden and repeated" outbreakings of persecution [1] which the Roman Church had recently suffered when Clement wrote, suits the character of the persecution by Domitian; and other internal proofs tend to confirm this conclusion. [2] After adverting to the heroes and martyrs of the Old Testament, Clement comes to those who are described as very near,[3] belonging, he says, "to our generation," [4] among whom he singles out the illustrious Apostles, Peter and Paul. With these he associates a "great multitude" of sufferers, contemporaries of the Apostles. [5] The phrase corresponds exactly to the "ingens multitudo" of Tacitus. These he represents as having endured varied tortures. Women, feeble in body, endured steadfastly the most cruel torments, and attained to the rewards of fidelity. His language is, "Women, Danaids, and Dircæ." What is meant by "Danaids and Dircæ?" Dirce, in the myth, was tied to a bull, and dragged about until she was killed. The Danaids, the fifty sisters, were killed by Lyncæus, together with their father, and in Hades were compelled to pour water into a vessel full of holes. The enacting of mythological scenes in which the players underwent the fate of those whom they personated, was one of the barbarous entertainments of the amphitheatres.[6] That Christian women were thus made to enact the part of Dirce, and of the Danaids, and that to horrible events of this sort in the Neronian persecution Clement here refers, is one interpretation

[1] —*αἰφνιδίους καὶ ἐπαλλήλους*. Clem. Epist. i.

[2] See the arguments and references of Prof. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of Clement*, Int., p. 4.

[3] *τοὺς ἐγγιστα γενομένους* (v.).

[4] *τῆς γενεᾶς ἡμῶν* (v.).

[5] C. vi. *πολὺ πλῆθος*.

[6] Interesting illustrative passages are given by Friedländer, ii. 386 seq. (ed. 3).

of the passage.[1] In this case those who were exhibited as Danaids may have been slain by one who personated Lyncæus, or they may have been forced to undergo different forms of torture which were described in the fables of Tartarus, until death put an end to their agony. Others, partly from the difficulty of conceiving of any rôle to be assigned to the Danaids, in a parody of the myth, which could satisfy the exigencies of the bloody arena, suppose an error in the text, and would leave out altogether the mythological allusion.[2] Whichever be the correct view, we have in this passage of Clement, in all probability, a distinct allusion to the terrible tragedy that followed the great fire at Rome, and in which a large number of Christians were the innocent victims.

The thrill of horror which the persecution of Nero sent throughout the Church everywhere, is manifest in the Apocalypse, which was written soon afterwards. In the year 819 A. U. C. (A. D. 66), Nero carried out his deferred plan of visiting Greece. His great ambition was to win crowns in the games, and to figure as an artist and a charioteer in the presence of the multitudes who would be drawn together to witness the unwonted spectacle of a Roman emperor in the character of a singer and play-actor. The contests of Olympia, Nemea, Delphi, and Corinth, in violation of the time-honored arrangement, were all celebrated during his stay in the country. He listened with rapture to the shouts of applause that greeted his performances on the stage, and in the chariot races. His fond-

[1] This is adopted by Renan, *l'Antechrist*, p. 169 seq. It is favored by Hefele, *Patres Apostol.*, p. 62, n. 2.

[2] So Lightfoot, *Clement, in loc.;* also, *Appendix*, p. 408. Dr. Lightfoot would substitute in the text (in the room of Δαναίδες καὶ Δίρκαι) νεάνιδες, παίδισκαι. Thus Clement would refer to "matrons, maidens, and slave-girls," as suffering indignities and cruelties which ended in their death.

ness for the Greeks, however, did not prevent him from rifling the public and private edifices of their treasures of art. On his return, he entered Rome in the fashion of a conqueror, bearing the chaplets which he had received during his tour through Greece. But he had not long to live. Before he came back from Greece, C. Julius Vindex, Prefect in Farther Gaul, proposed to Galba, the old Roman commander in Spain, that they should revolt, and that Galba should be made emperor. The plot of Vindex was discovered, and Virginius, the commander in Lower Germany, marched against him. Virginius was ready to join Vindex, but the soldiers of Virginius attacked the troops of Vindex, and the latter hastily destroyed himself. This gave Nero only a short respite. Virginius and Galba conspired together to effect a revolution. Soon it became unsafe for Nero to remain in Rome. He fled at early dawn, on the 9th of June, A. D. 68, to the villa of his freedman Phaon, four miles from the city. Thither he was soon pursued by the soldiers who were sent to seize him; and just as they entered the house, he summoned courage enough, with the aid of the slave Epaphroditus, to slay himself with a sword. He was in the thirty-first year of his age, and his reign had continued for a little less than fourteen years.

It was while Nero was in Greece that the announcement was made to him of a shameful disaster to the Roman arms in Judea. The reckless tyranny of the last of the Procurators, Gessius Florus, had at length provoked an open revolt.[1] The governor of Syria, Cestius Gallus, led an army as far as the walls of Jerusalem (A. D. 68); but despairing, with the force under his command, of reducing this almost impregnable city, he turned backward. At Bethlehem he was overtaken and attacked by the Jews

[1] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, II. xiv.–xviii.

with such headlong bravery, that his defeat became a rout, and his war material fell into the hands of the assailants, to be used afterwards against their oppressors.[1] Nero had in that region a valiant and competent general in the person of Corbulo; but him, out of jealousy of his power and influence, Nero summoned to Greece, and on the arrival of this commander at Cenchreæ, the port of Corinth, he was met with a message directing him to kill himself; a command which he at once obeyed. As a leader of the forces in Palestine, Nero pitched upon Vespasian, a veteran soldier, and one whose advanced age, it was supposed, was a safeguard against schemes of ambition.

We have referred to the transfer of the Apostle John's abode to Asia Minor as pretty nearly coincident with the beginning of the great Jewish War. The Apostle Philip and his daughters, it has already been stated, came to Hierapolis. At least two other disciples of Jesus, John the Presbyter and Aristion, are known to have lived in this region. The references to the elders, immediate followers of Christ, which are made by Papias and by Irenæus, suggest that when the Apostles, driven from Judea by the tumult that raged there, removed to Asia Minor, they were accompanied by a considerable number of their fellow-disciples.

The date of the Apocalypse is capable of being almost exactly determined. When it was written, the temple at Jerusalem was still standing (xi. 1–14). It is, also, clear that Christians had endured bloody persecution at the hands of the heathen (vi. 9–11, cf. ver. 15). References are made to those who had been slain "for the word of God and for the testimony which they held." In other passages, Rome, which is designated under the name of Babylon, is in particular made the author of sanguinary

[1] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, II. xix. 9.

persecution. She is drunk with the blood of the saints and martyrs (xvii. 6): in her is found "the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon earth" (xviii. 24): she has destroyed "holy Apostles and Prophets" (ver. 20). That Rome is meant by "the beast" is indicated by the mystic number (xiii. 18) which signifies *Latinus* (Λατεῖνος). That the persecution described is that under Nero is shown by ch. xvii. 10. After saying that the "seven heads" of the beast are "seven mountains" —the hills on which Rome was built—the Seer proceeds: "And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space." The book was written under the sixth of the Roman Emperors. The list of the Emperors is as follows: (1) Augustus, (2) Tiberius, (3) Caligula, (4) Claudius, (5) Nero, (6) Galba, (7) Otho, (8) Vitellius, (9) Vespasian, (10) Titus, (11) Domitian. The question arises, however, whether Galba, Otho, and Vitellius are included in the enumeration as made by the writer of the Apocalypse, or whether the space filled by them is considered an interregnum. That it might naturally be so considered is indicated in the language in which this interval is described by Suetonius.[1] Galba attained to power in A. D. 68, and Vespasian became Emperor in A. D. 69; so that, as Jerusalem was captured in A. D. 70, the date of the composition of the Apocalypse is shut up within narrow limits.

Upon Vespasian was devolved the hard task of conquering the Jews. In the winter of A. D. 67, he gathered his army together in Antioch, while at the same time Titus

[1] *Vespasian*, i. Rebellione trium principum et cæde incertum diu et quasi vagum imperium suscepit firmavitque tandem gens Flavia. Compare Düsterdieck, *Offenb. Johann.*, p. 53.

was sent to Alexandria to bring from there two legions.[1] From Antioch, Vespasian led his forces to Ptolemais, and there awaited the coming of Titus. Sepphoris, one of the most important places in Galilee, submitted of its own accord, and received a Roman garrison of 6000 men. When Vespasian began the campaign, his troops in the aggregate numbered 60,000. Josephus, the historian, who had been entrusted with the defence of Galilee, found himself unable to withstand the Romans in the field, and the open country of Galilee was soon in their possession. The Romans then laid siege to the strongly fortified city of Jotapata, where Josephus commanded in person.[2] After a most persevering resistance, in which the attacking force suffered severely, the place was taken. The inhabitants, with the exception of the women and infants, were put to the sword. The numerical statements of Josephus, neither here nor elsewhere, can be strictly depended on. He states that in the capture of the town, and in the conflicts preceding it, forty thousand Jews perished. In most of the places that were taken, always where there was a stubborn resistance, a general massacre followed. Josephus details the remarkable circumstances of his own escape from death, and explains the motives that led him to join the Romans in the war against his countrymen. According to the usual course of revolutions, the zealots were getting the management of every thing into their own hands. These were equally hostile to the moderate party of their own countrymen, and to the Romans; and the Jewish historian professes to have foreseen that the continuance of the struggle could only lead to the utter ruin of his nation. Vespasian, after giving his soldiers an interval of rest at Cæsarea, resumed the contest. Tiberias opened its gates to Titus, and the next great siege was before the walls of Tarichea, which

[1] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* III. i. 3. [2] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, III. vii. 3 seq.

was obliged to yield. The killed, according to Josephus, were 6500 in number; and the strangers in the city, having been sent to Tiberias, were gathered together in the circus there. Twelve hundred of the old and unserviceable were ordered by Vespasian to be slain. Six thousand of the most robust of the youth were sent to Nero, to be employed in digging the canal which it was proposed to make across the Isthmus of Corinth. Of the remainder, amounting to 30,400, some were given to Agrippa, and the rest were sold as slaves.[1] Gamala was next attacked. The Romans at length succeeded in entering the town, but were driven out by the fierce onset of its defenders. Recovering from this defeat, they rushed in again, and this time were victorious. During this siege, Mt. Tabor, which had been fortified, was also taken by a force detached for the purpose. In Gischala, John, one of the many leaders of the fanatical Zealots, had placed himself; but as he contrived to withdraw with the forces attached to his person, the town was delivered up with the consent of the inhabitants. At the end of the year 67, all Galilee was subdued.

The fanatical or popular party, the Zealots, demanded that the war should be under different control. They got the upper hand at Jerusalem so far as to wrest the high-priesthood from the hands of the aristocratic party. The city was thus torn by the strife of the two factions, the principal man of the moderate party being Ananus, and John of Gischala being the chief of the more violent faction. Vespasian saw that it would be politic to let the parties in Jerusalem spend their energies in mutual conflict. The Zealots reinforced themselves by admitting to the city fierce bands of Idumeans. The high-priest, Ananus, the main reliance of the party of order, was slain. The Idumeans finally separated from the Zealots, and pros-

[1] Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, III. x. 10.

ecuted the business of robbery and murder on their own account. Vespasian, leaving this domestic strife to go on within the walls of Jerusalem, used his forces in conquering Gadara, and afterwards, through one of his officers, Placidus, the whole of Perea. Later, he made a victorious march through Idumea, and laid siege to Jericho. The death of Nero and the political events that followed in rapid succession, delayed the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, for which Vespasian had prepared by previously subjugating, with an enormous destruction of life, the rest of the country. Another leader of the Zealots, Simon, a rival of John, after ravaging a portion of Judea, had been received into Jerusalem, and now divided power with John, both being in deadly hostility to each other. A third faction under Eleazar, a son of Simon, arose; and all three, each having possession of a certain district of the city, were in constant warfare with each other, so that Jerusalem was filled with confusion and carnage.

In April A. D. 70, Titus began the memorable siege, of which the details are given so fully in the narrative of Josephus. The factions finally ceased to destroy each other, and united against the common enemy. But the bravery of the people could not hold out forever against the steady discipline and military skill of the Romans, aided as they were by terrible famine, and by outbreakings of mad dissension, within the walls. The fall of the city was attended, against the will of Titus, as Josephus assures us, with the conflagration of the temple. When the troops had grown weary of slaughter, Titus gave directions to kill only those found in arms. But they continued to slay the old and feeble. The tallest and most handsome of the youth the commander reserved for his triumph. Of the rest, those who were above seventeen years old were sent in chains to the works in Egypt, though a great many

were distributed through the provinces to be destroyed in gladiatorial contests. The whole number of prisoners in the course of the war is estimated by Josephus at 97,000; and he states that 1,100,000 perished during the siege. Although this last number is greatly exaggerated, yet if all reasonable deductions are made, there is no doubt that the destruction of life by famine, disease, the murderous spirit of faction, and the weapons of the Romans, was appalling.

Josephus at the close of his account of the conflagration of the temple, an event that struck the stoutest hearts among the Jews with dismay, says of his countrymen: "What chiefly incited them to this war, was an ambiguous oracle that was found also in their sacred writings, how 'about that time one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth.' The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were deceived in the interpretation of it."[1] It was false ideals and fanatical beliefs respecting the Messiah, that impelled them to the contest which brought ruin upon them and upon their sanctuary. Thus, strictly in the train of natural causes, was fulfilled the judgment predicted in the words: "Behold your house is left unto you desolate!"[2] The destruction of Jerusalem and of the Jewish nationality followed, in the line of cause and effect, upon the rejection of Jesus. But this catastrophe, by setting free the Church from the overshadowing influence of the Temple, left the Christian faith more free to move forward to the conquest of the Roman world. The conquerors of the Jews were themselves to bow to that faith in which the religion of the conquered survived in a purer form and with a new vitality.

As a rule, the Roman government did not meddle with

[1] B. J. VI. v. 4.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 38.

the votaries of a religion as long as they were guilty of no excesses or irregularities offensive to the accepted standard of morals or subversive of order, and provided Roman citizens were not enticed to forsake the legal and ancestral forms of worship. But Christianity, as soon as its disciples were numerous enough to attract attention as a distinct body, became obnoxious both to public opinion and to the laws. Christians were commonly styled Atheists. "Away with the Atheists!"—the cry of the mob which demanded the death of Polycarp[1]—expressed the common idea concerning the sect which had no visible object of worship, and absented themselves from the temples, and all the public ceremonies of heathenism.[2] Wild notions respecting the character of the devotions practiced by Christians gained ready credence. It was said that they worshipped the Deity under the symbol of an ass's head—a calumny which Tertullian charges upon Tacitus as its inventor.[3] Next to the imputation of Atheism and irreligion, the poor and obscure condition of the Christians, and the fact that the ignorant and vicious were invited to partake of the blessings of the Gospel, was a ground of reproach. In the "Peregrinus" of Lucian, they are said to have persuaded themselves that they are immortal, and to despise death, and to have been persuaded by their lawgiver that they are all brethren. Any cunning impostor, says Lucian, can grow rich by pretending to be a Christian, and imposing on the credulity of these "weak and foolish men."[4] Celsus who wrote about A. D. 180, embodies in his work against Christianity the prejudices and objections that were current among the heathen. The record of miracles he ascribes to

[1] Martyrdom of Polycarp, c. iii. [2] See, e. g., Justin, Apol. i. 6, 13.
[3] Tertullian, *Apologet.*, 16.
[4] ἰδιώταις ἀνθρώποις. Peregrin., 11 (ed. Iacobitz).

fraud and credulity, and puts these phenomena on a level with the feats of magic to which he had given special attention. But the fact that the founders of Christianity and its disciples are of the lower class, that not philosophers and men of high standing, intellectually and morally, are appealed to, but that the ignorant and degraded portion of society furnish recruits to the new sect,—this it is that excites against it the bitter animadversion of Celsus. This contrast between Christianity as a religion of the heart, accessible to all, and regarding with special compassion the poor man and the outcast, and the creeds of philosophy, which gave precedence to the "wise and prudent," and created an intellectual oligarchy, provoked a contemptuous estimate of the new faith on the part of those of whom Celsus is a representative. It is scarcely a matter of surprise that Christian societies, made up as at first they were, almost exclusively, from the humbler class, should be suspected of meeting for purposes of conviviality and debauchery, and that even rumors of hideous crimes, such as were often imputed to the Jews in the middle ages, should be propagated concerning them.

Christianity might easily awaken suspicion in the minds of Roman officials, as a new faith, not to be identified with any other existing religion. The abstinence of its disciples from participation in the rites prescribed by law and custom, their refusal to make offerings to the genius of the emperor, and their habit of meeting together in private, might suggest to the government, which was keenly jealous of all secret assemblies and clubs, that they were fomenting some political scheme involving danger to the state. Their "obstinacy," when they were arraigned, was taken as another evidence of disloyalty. Tertullian gives the two prime grounds of persecution on the part of the Roman authorities: "'You do not worship the Gods,' you

say, 'and you do not offer sacrifices for the emperors.'" "So we are accused of sacrilege and treason."[1] "This is the chief ground of accusation against us—nay, it is the sum total of our offending."[2] The rulers in the provinces were authorized to prohibit whatever might be considered hazardous to order, or injurious to the safety and welfare of the community. It may have been in consequence of provincial prohibitions of this kind, that the younger Pliny, in the year 112, who was exercising proconsular powers in Bithynia, undertook to punish those who were accused of being Christians, and wrote his famous letter to Trajan.[3] This correspondence between Pliny and his master opens to view for a moment the suffering and struggling church at the beginning of the second century, the fortunes of which are left in such obscurity by the silence of the classical writers, and by the extent to which the Christian writings of the period have perished. In that region, where Pliny was ruling, there were many of all ages and both sexes, and—not of the poor alone—but of every rank, who were charged with being disciples of Christ. The Christian faith had spread as "a contagion," not only in the cities, but also in the country places; so that the temples had been almost deserted, and the victims for sacrifice had attracted but few purchasers.

In the dearth of precise information as to the rapid progress of Christianity in the Roman Empire, the fact has been made a subject of speculation. Gibbon's five causes are the zeal of the early Christians, which he represents to have been derived from the Jews, but to have been purged

[1] Sacrilegii et majestatis rei convenimur. *Apologet.*, 10.

[2] Cf. Boissier's Art., *Les Premières persécutions de l'Église*, in the *Rev. d. deux Mondes*, April 15, 1876.

[3] Plin., *Epist.* 97.

of Jewish narrowness; the doctrine of a future life of rewards and punishments; the power of working miracles, ascribed to the primitive church; the pure and austere morals of the Christians; and the union and discipline of the Christian republic—the ecclesiastical community.[1]

But, it has been pertinently remarked, Gibbon has not thought of accounting for the combination of these causes. "If they are ever so available for his purpose, still that availableness arises out of their coincidence, and out of what does that coincidence arise? Until this is explained, nothing is explained, and the question had better have been let alone. These presumed causes are quite distinct from each other, and, I say, the wonder is how they came together. How came a multitude of Gentiles to be influenced with Jewish zeal? How came zealots to submit to a strict ecclesiastical *régime?* What connection has such a *régime* with the immortality of the soul? Why should immortality, a philosophical doctrine, lead to belief in miracles, which is a superstition of the vulgar? What tendency had miracles and magic to make men austerely virtuous? Lastly, what power had a code of virtue as calm and enlightened as that of Antoninus to generate a zeal as fierce as that of Maccabeus? Wonderful events before now have apparently been nothing but coincidences, certainly; but they do not become less wonderful by cataloguing their constituent causes, unless we also show how these came to be constituent."[2]

Another natural reflection is that Gibbon's causes are separately the effects of Christianity, and, as such, are themselves to be accounted for. Whence the zeal of the first Christians? How could it be derived from the Jews, since most of the propagandists of the Gospel in the first

[1] Decline and Fall, ch. xv.

[2] Dr. J. H. Newman, *Grammar of Assent*, pp. 445, 446.

three centuries were of Gentile extraction? And if derived from the Jews, how did this zeal become purged of the bigotry and exclusiveness that had belonged to it? Whence the doctrine of the future life, as a living faith, in the midst of the skeptical Roman world? How came this doctrine, freed from the images of an immoral and superstitious fancy, to seize on the convictions of Christian believers? If the power to work miracles was sincerely claimed, what was the source of this real or imaginary power? How were the morals of the first Christians purified, in the midst of the debasing influences that encircled them? And what gave coherence and unity to the organized Christian society? Lying back of these agencies, to which the rapid spread of the Gospel is ascribed, there must be something else out of which they themselves spring.

But, as Dr. Newman so clearly points out, these causes are not shown to be operative in the way and to the extent which Gibbon alleges. He means by zeal, the *esprit de corps* of the first Christians, or their party spirit. How does this operate to bring men into a society? The "old wine of Judaism, decanted into new Christian bottles" "would be too flat a stimulant, even if it admitted of such a transference." How did the Christian doctrine of future punishment—for it is this which Gibbon has in mind, when he speaks of the doctrine of a future life—get credence when "the belief in Styx and Tartarus was dying out?" How could the claim to work miracles make so strong an impression among those "who had plenty of portents of their own?" How could the virtues of the Christians attract those who did not love virtue, and who must practice the Christian virtues in the face of the rack and the wild beasts of the amphitheatre? How could the unity of organization in the Church draw in the world out-

side, whatever power it might exert in holding those who had once entered within its pale?[1]

The statements of Gibbon undoubtedly suggest aspects of Christianity in which its power was manifested, and through which in part it won its conquests. But he leaves out what was the life and soul of the Christian religion, and the secret of its power,—the thought of Christ, the image of Christ, the great object of love and hope, and the source of inspiration. The zeal was zeal for a person, and for a cause identified with Him; the belief in the future life sprang out of faith in Him who had died and risen again, and ascended to Heaven; the miraculous powers of the early disciples were consciously connected with the same source; the purification of morals, and the fraternal unity, which lay at the basis of ecclesiastical association, among the early Christians, were likewise the fruit of their relation to Christ, and their common love to Him. The victory of Christianity in the Roman world was the victory of Christ, who was lifted up that He might draw all men unto Him.

When we cast about for the proximate causes, or auxiliaries, in this wonderful historical change, which, in the course of three centuries, advanced an unimportant, despised sect to the throne of the Cæsars, the one most worthy of notice is the powerful appeal which the new religion made everywhere to the poor and oppressed, and to all the multitudes for whom the world had little to offer in the way of joy or hope. From the outset, women recognized in the new religion a blessing for them, greater than had ever before seemed possible. The adaptedness of the Christian faith to all such, which was made a reproach against it by supercilious antagonists, constitutes one of its chief glories, as it certainly was no small part of the means of its success.

[1] Ibid., pp. 446, 447.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST CENTURY.

THE first glimpse which is afforded us, in the Book of Acts, of the infant Church at Jerusalem, reveals the vigor of the new organific principle which united its members in one body, notwithstanding their continued recognition of the rites and obligations of the Old Covenant. It wore the semblance of a Jewish sect; and Jewish sects were not like modern non-conformists. They generally added peculiarities of doctrine and practice to the faith and worship which belonged to them in common with their countrymen. Belief in Jesus as the Messiah was the inspiring creed of the new community which Luke describes. They still observed the regular hours prescribed by Jewish devotion for daily prayer (Acts ii. 46). They had no thought of deserting the temple. And yet they consciously formed a brotherhood, united in the closest bond. Superadded to the prayers which they offered each day, in conjunction with the people generally, in the great Sanctuary of the nation, they met in their own place of assembly, or in a private house. There they joined in a common meal, which concluded with a solemn partaking of bread and wine,—the whole being a commemoration of the Last Supper of the Lord with His Disciples. This meal, accompanied with prayer and song, and which at a later day received the name of Agape, or Feast of Love, was the original

method of celebrating the Lord's Supper. It was one great family, gathering about a common table, and signifying by this means—so natural and familiar in all ages—their union with one another, and with the absent Head of the Household. The common meal of the Essenes was something analogous among the Jews. Among the Greeks, the banquets where the participants brought the provisions, or where they were bought from a common fund, and the sodalities or clubs, which ate together occasionally, and had arrangements for mutual help in distress, as by the loan of money, afforded some distant resemblance to the Feasts of Love which existed in the early churches wherever Christianity spread. Among the heathen converts, they took place towards night, at the usual time of the principal meal. They came to be held once a week, on the Lord's day. The men and women sat at different tables. The repast was introduced by a prayer of blessing, and closed with a prayer of thanksgiving, or the Eucharist, from which the name of the Lord's Supper was derived; the meal thus maintaining a likeness to the Last Supper of Jesus, and to the Passover. When the younger Pliny wrote his letter to Trajan respecting the Christians in Bithynia (A. D. 112), the Communion still took place there late in the day, in connection with the Agape. Thirty or forty years afterwards, as we gather from Justin Martyr,[1] the separation had taken place; and while the Agape was late in the afternoon, the Eucharist was celebrated in the morning. Occasional disorders which occurred in connection with the Feasts of Charity, would naturally lead to such a change; and the more a feeling of mysterious sanctity associated itself with the distribution and reception of the Bread and Cup, the stronger the inclination naturally was to place the Holy Commemoration by itself,

[1] Apol. i. 66 seq.

and to partake of the consecrated symbols of the body and blood of Jesus, apart from all other food.

Tertullian, writing near the end of the second century, and replying to slanderous imputations from the side of the heathen, draws a picture of the Agape as it still existed.[1] "Our Feast," he says, "shows what it is by its name. The Greeks call it 'Love.' Whatever it costs, our outlay in the name of piety is gain, since with the good things of the Feast we benefit the needy. . . . If the object of our Feast be good, in the light of that object consider its further regulations. As it is an act of religious service, it admits of nothing that is vulgar or indecent. The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as befits the sober. They say 'it is enough', as those who remember that even during the night they have to worship God. They talk as those who are conscious that God is one of their auditors. [At the end of the Supper] after the washing of hands, and the bringing in of lights, each is asked to sing, as he is able, a hymn to God, either one from the Holy Scriptures, or one of his own composing,—a proof of the measure of our drinking. As the Feast commenced with prayer, so with prayer it is closed. We go from it, not like troops of mischief-doers, nor bands of roamers, nor to break out into licentious acts, but to have as much care of our modesty and chastity as if we had been at a school of virtue rather than a banquet." Yet abuses such as Paul refers to as having occurred at Corinth, might be expected to arise occasionally in connection with such a meal, and among recent converts from heathenism. Other evils likewise sprang up in the progress of time. Rich members of the Church, not without a spirit of ostentation, would pro-

[1] Apologet., c. 39.

vide the banquet for their poorer brethren. What was worse, when each brought his own contribution to the repast, the wealthy would provide themselves with more choice food. As the reverence for ecclesiastics grew, the clergy would be served with special attention. All these circumstances, combined with the provocation to scandal which assemblies of this kind, however innocent, could not fail to furnish to the heathen around, caused these Feasts, after a few centuries, to disappear altogether from among the usages of the Church.

Another act illustrative of the close fraternal relation in which the members of the new community at Jerusalem were conscious of standing to each other, was the bringing together of their property into a common treasury (Acts ii. 44, 45). Men sold their possessions, and gave up the proceeds to be applied to the uses and necessities of the entire household. Regarded as a spontaneous outburst of brotherly affection, the fact is significant and impressive. But even at the outset, not only was the community of goods purely voluntary, but it did not carry with it the entire relinquishment of private property; nor was it permanent. The Church was a brotherhood; no other relation so aptly distinguished the spirit of union and self-sacrifice which it was designed should belong to it. At the same time, Christianity was not intended to supplant the family institution, but only to purify and hallow domestic life. The Family and the State were both to subsist, each set off by its own proper boundaries. The life of the Church did not require the destruction of either. The example of the first Christians at Jerusalem has furnished a model for monastic fraternities in different ages. It is copied essentially, when, at the same time that property remains the possession of the individual by whom it is legitimately acquired, it is held and used in an unselfish

spirit, for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, and for the benefit of His followers.

The Apostles at first remained at Jerusalem, and superintended the Church there. The precedence of the Jewish people in the new kingdom, and the hope that they were to be brought into it as a body, entered into the habitual feeling of the Christian society at Jerusalem. The death of Stephen, and afterwards the martyrdom of James, the brother of John, were, as we have seen, events of marked influence in stimulating the leaders to wider efforts among the Jewish brethren elsewhere. James, the brother of the Lord, now assumes a kind of superintendence over the Church in the metropolis, though his authority, such as it was, was probably in the main personal, rather than formally conferred, or explicitly defined. The first incident of particular moment in relation to the polity of the Jerusalem Church, which Luke records, is the creation of the diaconate by the selection of seven persons to relieve the Apostles of the task of receiving and dispensing alms, to the end that they might devote themselves to their own great vocation, that of preaching the word (Acts vi. 1 seq.). The deacons were not to confine their services to the Greek-speaking Jewish Christians; nor can it be inferred from their Hellenic names that the new officers were all of this class. It has been announced by some without sufficient proof, that the seven, instead of being precursors of the deacons afterwards found in the churches, were in reality elders. That Luke gives no special account of the institution of the eldership need occasion no surprise. The diaconate, as it existed in the Church at Jerusalem, was a new office, due to the exigencies of the young community, and bearing no strict analogy to any office previously belonging to the synagogue. Generally speaking, the polity of the churches was a free copy from the organiza-

tion of the synagogue, with which the first Christians were familiar. The Apostles placed each of the churches which they founded under the superintendence of elders, whose places, as they became vacant, were to be filled by the act, at least with the concurrence, of the body of the church members.[1] In all the larger churches, the churches in cities, there was a plural eldership; that is, there was a board of elders in each church. The elevation of one of them to a precedence over his colleagues did not take place at the same time in all the churches, nor was it due everywhere to identical causes.[2] Within the covers of the New Testament, the terms 'presbyter' and 'bishop' are synonymous. The former was the designation of a ruler of the synagogue; the latter (ἐπίσκοπος) was applied to Athenian officers charged with the administration of tributary cities. But this term, as well as 'elder,' had its Hebrew synonyms, and was not new to readers of the Septuagint version of the Scriptures. In the same way, 'ecclesia,' the usual term for church, was the familiar Greek translation of the Old Testament 'congregation,' or assembly of the people; having, therefore, Hebraic, as well as Hellenic, associations. The original parity of the ministry gave way to the early episcopate, which spread rapidly, and became universal in the first half of the second century. Ignatius of Antioch is the first writer who brings to light this change in ecclesiastical arrangements.[3] In the Churches of Asia Minor when he wrote—A. D. 107 or

[1] Clem. Rom., *ad Corinth.*, xlv.

[2] Respecting the rise of the Episcopate, there is, at the present day, a near approach to a *consensus* among scholars in the various Protestant Churches. A thoroughly learned and candid discussion of the whole subject is presented in Prof. J. B. Lightfoot's Excursus on "the Christian Ministry," appended to his Commentary on the Philippians.

[3] We assume, as the more probable opinion, the genuineness of the Seven Greek Epistles in the Shorter Form.

108—the bishop was above the presbyters; although it would be rash to affirm that the extravagant homage which this author is anxious to secure for bishops, was shared by any considerable number of his contemporaries. On the contrary, when Clement of Rome, at a somewhat earlier date (A. D. 96 or 97), wrote his Epistle to the Church of Corinth, the equality of the presbyters there still continued.[1] There is no implication that there was any departure on this point from the earlier method of polity, but decided evidence to the contrary. Polycarp, who wrote after Ignatius, and is himself generally styled Bishop of Smyrna, implies in his Epistle that at Philippi the presbyters were still co-equal. Clement of Alexandria, although the distinction of the bishop from the presbyters is implied, speaks, in various passages, in a manner to indicate that the two offices are essentially the same.[2] Irenæus, towards the end of the second century, and other later writers, also, frequently style the bishop a presbyter.[3] Their language is not without traces of that primitive identity of the two offices, which is distinctly asserted by Jerome,[4] and, before him, by Hilary Ambrosiaster,[5] and which the Apostolic writings exhibit.

The change of the presbyterial into the episcopal arrangement took place naturally, in the circumstances in which the early churches were placed. The presidency of some one member in a body of persons who are to act together, arises almost of itself. The personal consideration of individuals, from their relation to Apostles, or from their peculiar talents and moral worth, would not be without its

[1] See §§ 42, 44: cf. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 95, 96, and his ed. of Clement, pp. 128, 133, 137.

[2] E. g. Strom, viii. 1: cf. Lightfoot, p. 224.

[3] E. g. Adv. Hær., III. ii. 2.

[4] Epist. lxix.; ad Tit., 1, 5.

[5] On Eph. iv. 11: cf. Lightfoot, p. 97.

effect in promoting this change. The example contained in the superintendence exercised by James at Jerusalem—which the spurious Clementine writings magnify into an oversight over all the churches—might easily be followed. The presence of the Gnostic sectaries stimulated the churches in the second century to consolidate their organization; and this would lead them to welcome the unifying agency of the Episcopate. It is not improbable that before the death of the Apostle John, it was established in the Asian churches which were within the circle of his special influence, and where the traces of an Episcopal constitution first appear.

It should be borne in mind in all discussions of this topic that the early episcopacy was purely governmental. The sacerdotal conception of the ministry is not found in Ignatius, in Clement of Rome, or Clement of Alexandria, in Justin, or in Irenæus, or in any other ecclesiastical writer prior to Tertullian. Bishops were the custodians of order; their functions were those of oversight and superintendence. The notion that a priestly unction and a mediatorial office, analogous to that of the hierarchy of the old covenant, belonged to the Christian ministry, is equally foreign to the Fathers of the first age and to the writers of the New Testament. The ministry were held to represent the congregation of believers, and not to be distinguished as a higher and separate order from them. They were inducted into the office by the old Jewish rite of the laying on of hands, which signified a consecration to some sacred work or use, and if the Holy Spirit was expected to be imparted to them, it was in response to the prayers offered in connection with the rite, and not as if a divine gift were conveyed by means of it, or a magical virtue imparted by the touch. Gradually in the church, ordination came to be the peculiar prerogative of the bishop; but

as late as the Council of Ancyra (A. D. 314), we find by the 13th canon, that presbyters, with the bishop's consent, may still ordain. In the great church of Alexandria, as we are told by Jerome,[1] down to the middle of the third century, a vacancy in the episcopal office was filled by the twelve presbyters from their own number, who, it would appear, if he received any new consecration, themselves advanced him to the higher office—as, indeed, Hilary Ambrosiaster,[2] and Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century,[3] with independent sources of information, expressly state.

Going back to the first institution of the eldership, we find that its primary function was that of oversight, or government. Elders were not chosen at first to teach. They might teach, indeed, but teaching was free in the Apostolic Church; and their office at the outset imposed no such obligation. Nor was there a class of elders explictly appointed to teach, and another class appointed to rule. Rather is it true that the office, originally designed, like the similar station in the synagogue, as an office of superintendence, took on the additional function of teaching, first as the result of a natural tendency, and of circumstances; and that finally, as we approach the close of the Apostolic age, an aptitude to teach comes to be counted one of its necessary attributes.

In towns, where the number of Christians was considerable, the eldership, as we have said, was plural. The church "in the house" of one or another, was not a separate organization, but simply a meeting-place of a fraction of the community of believers, who might, for want of a sufficiently spacious edifice, be compelled to hold their

[1] Epist. cxlvi. *ad Evang.* [2] On Eph. iv. 12.

[3] Annales I. p. 331 (Oxon. 1656). Cf. Lightfoot, p. 229, and Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.*, I. p. 140, N. 2.

worship in more than one apartment. But the churches in the Apostolic age were municipal in their boundaries. Nor was there any organic confederation of churches. Such arrangements were developed later, in connection with the synodal system. But in country places, a single elder presided over the church. The rural bishops, thus constituted, retained their independence of the neighboring city communities of Christians, for a considerable period; until, at length, in the course of the third and fourth centuries, through the pressure of the confederative system, and the development of the hierarchy, they lost their independence, and came, like the city presbyters, under the jurisdiction of the urban bishop.

Evangelists, like Timothy, Titus, Silas, were assistants of Apostles, acting as their deputies in the promulgation of the Gospel, and in the organization of churches; but the episcopal office, as it existed in the second century and later, had no genetic connection with this class of missionaries. The bishop, like the presbyters associated with him, was pastor of a local church, the church of a town, and he differed widely from a specially appointed class of itinerant Apostolic helpers. It is remarkable that in the oldest documents in which the primitive episcopal polity is brought to light, the Ignatian Epistles, the bishop is described as the successor of Christ, the presbyters being called the successors of the Apostles.[1]

In point of fact, the churches in the Apostolic age, as we have said, were bounded by municipal limits. Apart from their common relation to Apostolic guidance, each of these communities was complete in itself. They were in communion with one another, and a rupture of this communion, through the act of one or more of the churches, except for a very grave cause, would have been considered

[1] Epist. ad. Trall., ii., iii.

an unchristian proceeding. But the independence of the local or municipal church was not the result of an ordinance of the Apostles. It was not declared that this polity existed by divine right. Such a declaration, had it been made, would have prevented that development of confederate organization, which, whether for good or for evil, so quickly ensued.

While the churches did not attempt to govern one another, they held themselves at liberty to address to one another words of counsel and rebuke, as well as of comfort in affliction. It was inevitable that churches should be regarded with different degrees of respect, that there should be more deference paid to opinions and admonitions of churches eminent on account of the number, or piety, or beneficence of their members, or on account of their situation in places of importance. The Church at Jerusalem, up to the time of its dispersion in the Jewish war, had a moral preëminence. For a score of years that followed this epoch, an analogous rank appears to have been conceded to the Church at Ephesus. But all circumstances conspired to elevate the Church at Rome in the eyes of Christians everywhere. A moral ascendancy passes, with an insensible gradation, into actual authority. A newly discovered document—the concluding portion of the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians—illustrates, in a very interesting manner, the nature and extent of that moral influence which the Roman Church, a few years prior to the end of the first century, by common consent exercised in relation to other churches. This Epistle is written in a friendly and fraternal spirit. Yet these words occur in it: "Receive our counsel, and ye shall have no occasion of regret. For as God liveth, and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit, who are the faith and hope of the elect, so surely shall he who with lowliness of mind and constant in gentleness hath

without regretfulness performed the ordinances and commandments that are given by God, be enrolled and have a name among the number of them that are saved through Jesus Christ, through whom is the glory unto Him forever and ever. Amen. But if certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by him through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and danger."[1] There was disturbance and contention in the Church at Corinth, and their brethren at Rome, from whom this letter emanates, are conscious that their exhortations are from the Holy Spirit. It is not from arrogance, or from an assumed right to exercise rule over the Corinthian Christians, that they write in this tone. Nevertheless, we may perceive here the germ of those lofty pretensions of the Church of Rome, the growth of which, in its successive stages, it is part of the business of ecclesiastical history to describe. One marked feature of this Letter deserves attention.[2] Although written by Clement, his name nowhere appears in it. He writes as the organ of the church of which he is the pastor. It is this Church in its collective capacity, plurally designated, which sends this appeal to their brethren at Corinth. This circumstance brings to mind the fact, of which it is one evidence, that it was the Church at Rome which gave importance to the bishop, and not the bishop who exalted the Church.

As in the synagogue, so in the primitive churches, members who proved themselves unworthy, might be expelled from the fellowship; but this act, among Christians, according to the teaching of the Apostle Paul, was not merely a measure of self-defence against a contaminating

[1] §§ 58, 59 (Prof. Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome, Appendix*, pp. 375, 376).

[2] Compare Lightfoot, p. 252 seq.

influence, but, also, a means of reform to the offenders; nor was the need of maintaining the reputation of the Church before the heathen forgotten.

All offices, whether for the government or edification of the body, were considered as *charisms*—gifts of the Spirit. Persons who were designated by their peculiar natural powers, as quickened and directed by the Spirit, for the discharge of their functions, were appointed to fulfill them. Among the gifts of the Spirit was that of teaching. There was a class of persons who showed themselves specially adapted to speak in a moving and instructive way; and these were recognized as having a divine call to this service. They were not elders, though, as we have remarked above, elders might teach, and late in the Apostolic age, teaching came to be considered a necessary part of an elder's work. But teaching, as we have already said, was free in the Apostolic churches, in the sense that whoever felt himself impelled by an inward impulse to address his brethren, might do so at the proper time in the service. The gift of prophecy was not a foretelling of future events, but rather a fervid outpouring of Christian truth, it might be in the form of exhortation. The "teacher" expounded doctrine, in the exercise of reflection, and as a fruit of the study of the Old Testament Scriptures; though under an illumination from above. The utterances of the "prophets" were more improvised, and thus adapted to seize on the attention and thrill the mind, even of a pagan auditor who chanced to enter the Christian assemblies. The addresses of the "teacher" were in the form of didactic instruction; those of the "prophet" were hortatory, or at least predominantly emotional. These last might spring from an extravagant zeal, or enthusiasm, and contain an admixture of hurtful error. Hence there were persons competent to discern spirits, or to discrimi-

nate between what should be considered divine truth, and what should be rejected. The "speaking with tongues," which the Apostle Paul describes, appears to have been an outpouring of prayer in broken ejaculations and incoherent cries, when the mind, surcharged with emotion, was thrown into an ecstasy, so that "interpreters," possessed of a special gift, were required to convert these glowing exclamatory utterances into an intelligible form.[1] Besides these gifts, there

[1] The principal passages in the New Testament which refer to speaking with tongues are Mark xvi. 17 (which, however, does not belong in the original text), Acts ii. 1–13, x. 46, xix. 6, 1 Cor. xii., xiv. The references of Paul appear to be, not to a speaking in foreign languages, but to an ecstatic outburst of prayer and praise, in which the soul is swept on by a spiritual impulse, the ordinary exercise of invention and reflection being suspended. In Acts x. 46, xix. 6, a similar phenomenon would seem to be designated. The "speaking with tongues," in Acts ii. 1–13, was also an ecstatic outpouring of speech, "as the Spirit gave them utterance" (ver. 4). The strange and impassioned fervor of those who thus spoke, led some to say that they had drunk wine to excess (ver. 13). There is nothing to imply that a permanent knowledge of foreign languages was given to the early disciples. Peter's address (vers. 14–37) was in his ordinary dialect. The speaking with tongues, whatever it signifies, which preceded this address, was devotional, not didactic. There is no evidence in the Apostolic history that the preachers of the Gospel prosecuted their labors with the aid of such miraculous knowledge. The early Apologists do not refer to its existence. Whether Irenæus, in his reference to this subject (adv. Hær., V. vi. 1), means to denote speaking in different dialects, or only that ecstatic utterance of prayer which has been described, is not clear from his language. It is the latter, probably, to which Tertullian refers (adv. Marcion., v. 8). Nevertheless, a fair exegesis of Acts ii. 1–13 must allow that Luke here intends to describe a speaking in various languages; and such is the more natural interpretation of Mark xvi. 17. It follows either that the tradition which Luke followed had misinterpreted in this particular the phenomenon of the Pentecost—which is the opinion of Neander (*Plant. and Train. of the Church*, pp. 16, 17, ed. Robinson), and of Meyer (*Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 53, 54); or that the phenomenon to which Luke refers in Acts ii. was peculiar, and different from that which is discussed by Paul, and which was common in the Apostolic churches. This last opinion is defended by Dr. Schaff (*Hist. of the Apostolic Church*, p. 201 seq.).

were gifts of miracles, including the power to heal diseases without the intervention of the ordinary means of cure. Illustrations of the exercise of these powers are presented in the book of Acts; but they were not specially called into activity in the assemblies for worship. Thus, in the Apostolic church, all the functions of government, as well as of teaching, were in the hands of those who were conscious of acting as the organs of a Power above themselves, by whom they were singled out, each of them for his particular work. It was a community lifted up to this high pitch of earnestness. It was, to use the Apostle's simile, a body, every member of which served every other, and was served in turn by all. If the Christian meeting, gathered in some private house which afforded sufficient accommodation to the worshippers, bore a resemblance to the synagogue, it was the synagogue on fire with an ardor never witnessed in the Jewish assemblies.

Where the spontaneous element was thus powerful, there was all the more need of regulation. There was an order of service, modelled, in a general way, on that of the synagogue; yet so that room should be left for free utterance on the part of individuals, as feeling might prompt. It is probable that, in the life-time of the Apostles, the Scriptures of the Old Testament were read, in consecutive extracts, and that thus early the reading was attended by an exposition and application of the passage by him who conducted the worship. This was a copy of the synagogue practice. Later, the reading of the Gospels, also, was introduced, and, later still, the Apostolic Epistles were connected with the other Scriptures in this public use. There were prayers to

The different theories—including that of Bleek, who supposes that the speaking with tongues was the exclamatory utterance, under high-wrought excitement, of mystic, figurative words, some of which were foreign—are reviewed by Meyer.

which the people responded "Amen," and the singing of Psalms and Hymns. Not only were there extemporaneous prayers, but also effusions of song, on the part of individuals, and the exercise of the various gifts of the Spirit. The Apostle Paul found it necessary to discourage the "speaking with tongues," and like ebullitions of high-wrought feeling, which, if not restrained, might pass the bounds of sobriety. He discountenanced the speaking of women, which offended the ancient feeling of decorum, and might thus bring Christians into ill repute among the heathen. He likewise judged it a transgression of the sphere allotted in the divine order to females.

Among Jewish Christians, the observance of the weekly sabbath, and of the annual festivals which were appointed in the Mosaic Law, of course continued. In the Gentile churches this was not the case. Where the community was predominantly made up of Jews, the old observances might remain. But the Apostle Paul resisted the introduction of the Old Testament festivals, including the sabbath, into the churches which he had planted; declaring that by the adoption of them the Gentile believer forfeited the benefits of the Gospel, since he chose to rest his salvation upon rites, instead of upon Christ.[1] There is to be found in the New Testament no explicit appointment of the first day of the week as a day of Christian worship. Much less is there, either in the New Testament or in the ecclesiastical writers of the first centuries, any statement to the effect that the Christian institution was the Old Testament Sabbath enjoined in the decalogue, the first day being substituted for the seventh. Nevertheless, there are traces of the special religious commemoration of Sunday, the day of the Saviour's resurrection, in several passages of the New Tes-

[1] See Col. ii. 16, where the annual, monthly, and weekly festivals of the Jews are specified. Cf. Gal. iv. 10, Rom. xiv. 5, 6.

tament.[1] It is called the Lord's Day, in the book of Revelation. It is an observance that sprang up under the eye of the Apostles, and with their approval; at the same time that it was a spontaneous product of Christian feeling. On that day the early Christians joined in acts of joyful worship, and set apart their gifts for the poor. In churches composed of Jewish Christians, this consecration of the first day was associated with the continued observance of the Sabbath; which could not have been the case had there been a substitution, by an explicit ordinance, of the first day for the seventh.

Of the existence of yearly Christian festivals, there is no notice in the New Testament writings. That such festivals, with the exception of Easter, existed in the Apostolic age is not pretended. In the Paschal controversies of the second century, in which the churches of Asia Minor were opposed to churches elsewhere, the authority of the Apostle John was appealed to in support of the Asiatic observance. It would be extremely natural, certainly, wherever Jewish Christians were found, at the recurrence of the Passover season, to bring to mind the Saviour's death and resurrection; and to signalize this anniversary by some appropriate commemoration. This consideration, in connection with the fact just stated, and with the known fact of the wide-spread celebration of Easter in the second century, may lend support to the opinion that the beginnings of this Festival were prior to the death of John.

The celebrated letter, to which we have referred, written to Trajan about A. D. 112 by the younger Pliny, from Bithynia, where he was exercising proconsular powers under the Emperor, throws light upon the method of worship in the early church.[2] "They affirmed," he says of those whom he examined, "that the whole of their fault,

[1] Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, Rev. i. 10.

[2] Epistt., x. 97.

or error, lay in this,—that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately (invicem) a hymn to Christ as a god (quasi Deo), and to bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but that they would not be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, would not falsify their word, nor refuse to return a pledge committed to them, when called upon to do so. When these things were performed, they said that it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common, but without any disorder." The "stated day" on which the Christians assembled for worship, it is scarcely possible to doubt, was Sunday. Their religious service in this region was at a very early hour, before the dawn of day. The alternate singing of a hymn to Christ may be a loose and inexact description of the devotional service in which the people responded "Amen;" with which, however, singing was connected. And it is not needful to suppose that a formal engagement, such as is described, was made every week to abstain from the vices named. It is a description of the vows, which the Christians publicly assumed, to avoid the various forms of sin. The common meal to which reference is made was the Agape, or Feast of Love, which was celebrated near the close of the day, and with which, as we have stated above, the Lord's Supper was at that time still connected.

With this passage may be associated the statements of Justin, in the First Apology, written between A. D. 140 and 150: "On the day which is called Sunday, there is an assembly in the same place of all who live in cities, or in country districts; and the records of the Apostles [the Gospels], or the writings of the Prophets are read as long as we have time. Then the reader concludes; and the President verbally instructs and exhorts us, to the imi-

tation of these excellent things: then we all together rise and offer up our prayers; and, as I said before, when we have concluded our prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water; and the President, in like manner, offers up prayers and thanksgivings with all his strength; and the people give their assent by saying 'Amen;' and there is a distribution and partaking by every one, of the Eucharistic elements; and to those who are not present, they are sent by the hands of the deacons; and such as are in prosperous circumstances, and wish to do so, give what they will, each according to his choice; and what is collected is placed in the hands of the President, who assists the orphans and widows, and such as through sickness, or any other cause, are in want; and to those who are in bonds, and to strangers from afar, and, in a word, to all who are in need, he is a protector."[1] Here we have a mention of the reading of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and of the Gospels, which had come to be connected with it, and a reference to the practical exposition and hortation, which followed, and constituted the sermon. The prayers, with the responsive 'Amen' from the congregation, are next in the order. These are succeeded by the Eucharist, which is now disconnected from the Agape. The bread and wine, the latter being mingled with water, according to the Jewish practice, are partaken of by all, and are sent by the deacons to those who are detained at their homes. The collection of alms to be distributed to those in need, of every class, is a prominent part of divine service. Sunday is celebrated, Justin adds, as the first day on which God, when He changed the darkness and matter, made the world, and as the day of the Resurrection of Christ. In the room of the Jewish Sabbath, he elsewhere says,[2] "the new law commands a perpetual Sabbath."

[1] Apol. i. 67.

[2] Dial. c. Tryph., 12.

The principal rites in the early Church were Baptism and the Lord's supper. Baptism, it is now generally agreed among scholars, was commonly by immersion.[1] Whether infants were baptized in the Apostolic age, or exactly when the custom arose of administering this rite to them, is a controverted question on which the New Testament writings furnish no direct information. The mention of the baptism of households is not entirely conclusive, since we are not certain that infant children were contained in them; and, besides, if it were known that infants were not baptized, they would be understood to be excepted in a general statement of this sort respecting a household. In proportion as the Christian Church felt itself a distinct community, parted from the world of heathenism, the more naturally would this practice take root. Within the pale of the holy community the children of its members would be felt to be embraced.[2] Irenæus—who was born about A. D. 130—implies that infants were baptized in his time. Origen, a child of Christian parents, and born A. D. 155, was baptized in infancy, and regarded infant baptism as an

[1] See on this subject, Justin Martyr, Apol. i. 61. (cf. Prof. Stuart, *Bibl. Repos.*, 1833, p. 356); Tertullian, *de Baptismo*, passim, *de Corona*, 3; Cyprian, *Ep. lxxv.*; Chrysostom, *Hom. xi.* See, also, Calvin, *Institutt.* IV. xv. 19; Luther, *de Sacram. Baptismi*, Oper. Luth. 1564, i. 319. Bingham, *Antiquities*, i. 309; *Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexicon* (Roman Cath.), x. 673 (Art. *Taufe*); Herzog, *Real-Encycl.*, xv. 474 (Art. *Taufe*); Smith's *Bible Dict.* (Am. ed.) i. 14 (Art. *Baptism*); Smith's *Dict. of Christ. Antiquities*, i. 161, §§ 49 (cf. p. 168 §§ 92, 93); Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, i. 439, ii. 169; Stanley's *Eastern Church*, p. 117; Wall, *History of Infant Baptism*, ii. 327, 328; Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.*, i. 87; Neander, *Plant. and Train. of the Ch.*, (Am. ed.) p. 161, *Ch. Hist.*, i. 310; Blunt, *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, p. 75 (Art. *Baptism*); Schaff, *Hist. Apostol. Ch.*, p. 570, *Ch. Hist.*, i. 123. See, also, Meyer, *Komm. über das N. T.* (Mark i. 9, vii. 4, cf. Luke xi. 38); Bleek, *Synopt. Erkl. d. drei ersten Evangg.* (Mark i. 9); Winer, *N. T. Grammar* (Thayer's ed.), p. 412.

[2] 1 Cor. vii. 14.

Apostolic institution.[1] It sprang up early, and spread extensively, because it was regarded as consonant with Christian ideas, and with the proper conception of the Church. At the outset, the candidate for admission to the Church was baptized simply in the name of Christ. Later, the more extended baptismal formula came into general use. The one article of Faith at the beginning, the sole condition of acceptance to membership, was faith in Jesus as the Messiah. A more formal or extended creed did not exist. Baptism, according to the description of Justin, was preceded by prayer and fasting on the part of the candidate and of the people with him.[2] After the rite had been administered, they gathered in an assembly for common prayer. Then they saluted one another with a kiss; and the service concluded with the administration of the Communion—prayers and thanksgivings, to which the congregation responded "Amen," forming a part of this service.

With respect to the use of written forms of prayer in the worship of the early Christians, apart from the synagogue service, there is such a controversy as usually arises where the data necessary to an undoubting judgment are absent. It is agreed that, in the Apostolic age, extemporaneous prayer was in use in the churches. "Whilst the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit continued," says Bingham, "there is little doubt to be made but that prayers and hymns, immediately dictated by the Spirit, made up a part

[1] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, II. xxii. 4 ("qui per eum renascuntur in Deum"): on the sense of "renascuntur," see Neander, *Ch. Hist.* i. 311. Origen, *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.*, in the Latin Transl. ("ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismam dare"): cf. *Homil. in Levit.*, c. 4, *Homil. in Lucam*, 14. Tertullian recommends a delay of baptism in the case of infants, but he recommends delay, also, in the case of adults, which he must have known to be contrary to Apostolic usage. *De Baptismo*, xviii.

[2] Apol., i. 61.

of the ordinary service."[1] It is, also, agreed that after the introduction of written forms, for a considerable period, each bishop made his own liturgy for the use of the church over which he presided, and that this varied in form from time to time. As late as the time of Diocletian, or the close of the third century, there would seem to have been no ritual books, or compilations of prayers; since we have no record that any demand was made upon Christians for such books, when they were required to surrender their sacred writings.[2] That the Lord's Prayer was used in public worship in the second and third centuries is highly probable. It was considered, in the early Church, as a prayer for Christian disciples exclusively. In the description of Christian services, which we have cited from Justin Martyr, the President, or Bishop is said to offer up prayers and thanksgiving "with all his strength;" to which the people responded "Amen."[3] But whether these prayers were read or not, his language does not absolutely determine. It seems more probable however that the phrase, "with all his strength,"—or, "to the best of his ability," is applied to extemporaneous, rather than written devotions. It is less natural to suppose it to refer to vocal exertion, or to any fervency of that sort.[4] The quite recent recovery of a document still more ancient than the writings of Justin, throws some light upon this inquiry. Towards the close of his Epistle to the Corinthians, Clement of Rome introduces (A. D. 96 or 97) a

[1] Antiq., xiii. 5. 1. [2] Bingham, *Ibid.*, § 3. [3] Apol. i. 67.

[4] This is Prof. Lightfoot's opinion, also. See his *Ep. of Clement, Appendix*, p. 271 n. 1. The same phrase—ὅση δύναμις—is used by Gregory of Nazianzum (*Orat.* iv. 12), but not with reference exclusively to the singing of the song of Moses. It refers, in Gregory, to three acts of Christian worshippers,—the purifying of soul and body (ἁγνισάμενοι καὶ σώματα καὶ ψυχάς), the harmony of voice, and the union in the Spirit (συναρμοσθέντες Πνεύματι).

series of connected petitions to God of such a character as strongly to suggest that they are extracted from an established liturgy. Yet they do not purport to be a quotation from such a composition. A not improbable hypothesis is that they are a part of the fixed form which Clement used in the Roman Church; which, however, was held in memory, but not reduced to writing. If this theory be accepted, these passages may be considered to mark the transition from free extemporaneous utterances to established forms. They have the character of a fixed though still unwritten form.[1]

The mutual love of Christians, which appeared in the intercourse of those who were of different nations, and had previously been strangers, made the name of "brother," by which they designated each other, no empty word. A Christian, leaving his home, bore letters signifying his connection with the Church; and these ensured him a cordial hospitality in the places, however distant, to which he might travel. The power of the fraternal bond is signally manifest in the fact that the great differences between the Jewish and the Gentile convert, which were of such a character that the Church at the outset might almost be said to exist in two branches, did not prevent a mutual recognition and fellowship. The Apostles at Jerusalem gave the right hand of fellowship to the Gentile disciples, and the Apostle Paul in turn gathered from this class contributions which served as a token of fraternal esteem for the mother Church. The bounds of nationality were broken down, and the spectacle was presented of men widely removed from one another in language, culture, and social rank, blending in one family.

[1] Compare Prof. Lightfoot, *l. c.* See also, the excellent article of Mr. C. J. H. Ropes, *the New Manuscript of Clement of Rome*, in the *Presb. Quart. Rev.*, April, 1877.

With respect to the relation of Christians to heathen society about them, it was of course felt as a paramount obligation to avoid all participation in employments and recreations which were tainted with heathenism, or which savored of cruelty or licentiousness.

The grounds of the refusal of Christians to attend the public games and theatres, are set forth, at a later day, by Tertullian in his tract *de Spectaculis*. The heathen urged that the enjoyments of the eye and ear are not inconsistent with religion, and charged that Christians austerely abstained from pleasures of this nature, in order that, being trained to despise life, they might resign it the more willingly.[1] It was said that all things are made by God, and must be good as coming from Him. But there is a vast difference, Tertullian replies, between things as originally made, and the same after they have become corrupt. Some said that there was no express prohibition of the circus or theatre, in the Scriptures. Yet, says Tertullian, we are commanded not to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, or stand in the way of sinners (Ps. i. 1). We are to keep clear of evil companionship. The first main objection against the public shows is that in their origin and arrangements they are based on idolatry. The games (ludi) were in honor of the deities or of the dead. All the decorations of the circus are monuments and emblems of heathenism. A Christian may enter such places, may even go into heathen temples, if he has some honest errand, which is not connected with heathen beliefs or worship. He cannot avoid contact with the rites of idolatry.[2] What he has to shun is the lending of any sanction to them, either directly, or by his unnecessary presence. Equestrianism in its ordinary use is innocent; but in the circus it is associated with certain recognitions of idolatry. The brutality of gladia-

[1] § 1. [2] § 8.

torial combats was something on which a Christian could not voluntarily gaze.[1] The passionate excitement that was roused by the public games and shows was itself repugnant to the tempers of mind which the Christian aimed to cultivate.[2] With regard to the theatre, its immodesty was a sufficient objection to it. There was a folly and frivolity in many contests, such as wrestling, leaping, and running, which offended the sobriety of Christian feeling.[3] The low estimate in which the actors in the popular amusements were held by the heathen themselves, was virtual judgment against their occupations.[4] Christians ought to detest these heathen meetings and assemblies, if for no other reason, because God is blasphemed in them. There the cry, "To the lions," is daily raised against the disciples of Christ.[5] The disciple should look forward to the grandest of all spectacles, the fast approaching advent of the Lord to Judgment.[6] The treatise of Tertullian is not without occasional expressions of ascetic feeling, and fanciful, even puerile, objections to the amusements which he decries. On the whole, however, it is an earnest and cogent argument against practices which were either directly inconsistent with the Christian profession, or unsuited to the peculiar circumstances of a persecuted and struggling Church, exposed on all sides to contamination from heathen errors and vices.

Mixed marriages, where a Christian found himself the partner of a heathen wife (or husband), the Apostle Paul refused to dissolve.[7] He was willing to trust to the power of Christian piety to act through the vehicle of this relation for the conversion of the unbelieving party. Litigation before heathen tribunals he regarded as unbecoming, and as adapted to bringing disrepute upon the

[1] § 12. [2] § 16. [3] § 18. [4] §§ 22, 23. [5] § 27. [6] §§ 29, 30

[7] 1 Cor. vii. 12 seq. In 1 Tim. iii. 2 (Titus i. 6) a second marriage is made

Church.[1] Disputes should be settled, as undoubtedly they were generally settled, by arbiters called from the brethren. The position which the Church should hold towards the civil authority was a point in Christian ethics of capital importance. Here the founders of Christianity guarded with sedulous care against the development of anything like a disposition to interfere directly with the established political order. The state existed by divine appointment; the magistrate, even though a heathen, was a minister of God to execute justice within the sphere appointed for him.

An ancient document which has lately been brought to light—the missing portion of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians contains the following supplication for Rulers:—

> Give concord and peace to us and to all that dwell on the earth, as Thou gavest to our fathers, when they called on Thee in faith and truth with holiness, that we may be saved, while we render obedience to Thine Almighty and most excellent Name, and to our rulers and governors upon the earth. Thou, Lord and Master, hast given them the power of sovereignty through Thine excellent and unspeakable might, that we knowing the glory and honor which Thou hast given them may submit ourselves unto them, in nothing resisting Thy will. Grant unto them, therefore, health, peace, concord, stability, that they may administer the government which Thou hast given them without failure. For Thou, O Heavenly Master, King of the ages, givest to the sons of men glory and honor and power over all things that are upon the earth. Do

---

a disqualification for the office of bishop or deacon. That is the correct interpretation of the passage, is proved by 1 Tim. v. 9, where to have been "the wife of one man" is required in the case of a widow who is to be "taken into the number," or put on the list—possibly, of deaconesses. See Tertullian, *ad Uxor.*, i. 7, Ellicott, *in loc.* The heathen put honor upon abstinence from a second marriage, especially upon one who was *univira*. The injunctions (1 Tim. iii. 2, v. 9) may have had reference to this feeling. See Hefele, *Beiträge z. Kirchengesch.*, etc., i. 39. Younger widows the Apostle recommended to marry again (1 Tim. v. 14). On the class referred to in 1 Tim. v. 9, see Schaff, *Hist. of the Apostolic Ch.*, pp. 535, 536.

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 1–8.

Thou, Lord, direct their counsel according to that which is good and well-pleasing in Thy sight, that, administering in peace and gentleness with godliness, the power which Thou hast given them, they may obtain thy favor." [1]

Such were the petitions which the Christians of Rome offered to God in behalf of their rulers, at the moment when they had hardly escaped from the cruelty and caprice of Domitian.

In the Apostolic age, the writings of the Apostles were considered as supplementary to their oral instruction. The Epistles were written because it was impracticable for the authors of them to be present in person, at the time when they were composed, with those whom they addressed. The idea of collecting the writings of the Apostles, or of forming a canon, did not exist. As long as they were alive, there was less reason for separating the productions of their pen from other writings. As long as the memory of their teaching continued fresh, the same feeling would exist. The early Fathers make much of the living tradition which had preserved the substance of the Apostolic doctrine in the churches which they had planted. The Old Testament Scriptures were an ancient, recognized, authoritative collection, which was read in the churches, and to which appeal was made in controversies. The expectation of the Second Advent, widely diffused as it was in the early Church, of itself would have prevented the formation of a new body of sacred books. But when the Apostles had passed off the stage, when the difference between them and post-apostolic teachers was sensibly felt, when heretical doctrines began to be propagated, and heretical parties commenced to falsify the Apostolic writings, a desire would naturally be kindled to gather up the authentic documents which the guides of the Church, who

[1] Prof. Lightfoot's *S. Clement of Rome, App.*, §§ 61, 62, pp. 377, 378.

had been appointed by Christ Himself, had left behind them. Accordingly, in the course of the second century, we find that the canon is gradually forming itself. The term "canonical" signified normal, as constituting a rule and source of faith, or it was used as a synonym of authorized, or approved in this character. In this last sense, it was first applied to the Scriptures. The process of making collections of the Apostolic writings would go on of itself. We find Paul (Col. iv. 16) providing that his Epistle to Colosse should be read at Laodicea, and also that his Epistle to Laodicea should be read to the Colossians. By this kind of interchange, and by kindred means, by degrees numerous collections of Apostolic writings must have grown up. The Epistle of Clement of Rome, the Epistle wrongly attributed to Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas, are sometimes quoted by writers of the second century with a respect similar to that paid to books of the Apostles. They were read in churches. Their authors were counted as inspired, since the notion of inspiration was not accurately defined. But in none of the early catalogues of the Scriptures is either of these books set down as canonical. Towards the close of the second century, the old Syrian, or Peschito, translation was made, and also the old Latin version. We have the catalogue in the Muratorian Fragment; and from Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Irenæus, and Tertullian, we learn what books were recognized by them, and by their contemporaries, as having a rightful place in the canon. In this century, the books of the New Testament are referred to in two divisions, "the Gospel" (*Εὐαγγέλιον*, or *Εὐαγγελικόν*), comprising the four Evangelists, and "the Apostle" (*ὁ Ἀπόστολος*, or *τὸ Ἀποστολικόν*), including the remaining books which were accepted as having Apostolic authority. It is obvious that certain books—as, for example, the Catholic

Epistles, and Epistles written first to individuals—would come into general circulation more slowly than others. There is reason to conclude that copies of the Gospels, early in the second century, had greatly multiplied.[1] Differences would exist, to some extent, in the catalogues in different places. A book that was acknowledged as canonical in one place might not be so recognized in another. Early in the fourth century, when Eusebius wrote his Church History, the writings of the New Testament were divided by him into two classes, those universally received by the churches (homologoumena), and those disputed, or not received by all (antilegomena). In the last category stand seven books, the Epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. Of most of these it seems probable that they were rather unknown, than rejected, in the quarters where they failed to be received. The second and third Epistles of John were not embraced in the Syriac version, but were generally acknowledged elsewhere. The Epistle of Jude was considered genuine in most of the churches. The Epistle of James was received by the Syrian churches, but wide-spread doubt respecting it existed in the churches of other countries. The Apocalypse which had been generally received in the middle of the second century, was now extensively rejected in the East. The Epistle to the Hebrews, which was received in the East, was not acknowledged by the Church of Rome, as not being by Paul. The second Epistle of Peter, the book for which the external testimony is weaker than for any other of the canon, is expressly rejected by Origen and Eusebius. The tendency to uniformity rapidly induced a coincidence on the part of all the churches in the recognition of the books with respect to which doubts had been entertained; and

[1] See Norton, *Gen. of the Gospels*, vol. i., p. 45 seq.

the work of critical investigation into their claims was reserved for subsequent ages.

Thus there arose in the midst of the Roman Empire a wide-spread, rapidly growing community, which had no other aim than to produce an entire moral renovation of society, which acknowledged Christ as its invisible king, and yet employed none but peaceful agencies, and owned, with sincere loyalty, as a religious duty, the obligation to obey the civil authority. In the higher allegiance paid to God, and in the consequent refusal to comply actively with mandates of the state which stood in conflict with the express requirements of the Gospel, even though torture and death were the penalty, there was, indeed, a principle of liberty, which was destined in after ages to give rise to momentous results.

As the Christian teachers did not directly assail the civil constitution, however defective it might be considered, so they did not try to sweep away by a revolutionary stroke the institution of slavery, which was so firmly established in ancient society. They set forth the common relation of master and servant to Christ, the Master of both; they declared that the master and slave, as brethren, were equal; they pointed out the inconsistency of all unkindness and oppression with the law of love; they enjoined upon both parties the duty of mutual forbearance and just dealing; but they did not formally terminate the relation.[1] It was left for the further development of Christian Ethics to define the proper relation of the laborer to the employer, as well as the provisions which Christian justice demands in every form of civil polity. The ancient Church acted in the spirit of Christ, when He asked, "Who made me a judge or a divider over you?"[2] It

[1] Eph. vi. 9, Col. iv. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 22. [2] Luke xii. 14.

sought to eradicate the selfishness out of which all forms of injustice spring. The best illustration of the spirit in which Christianity confronted the institution of slavery, is afforded by the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, a Christian at Colosse, whose slave, Onesimus, had fled to Rome, and there, under the influence of the Apostle's teaching, had been converted. Paul sends him back—of course, in full accordance with the servant's own choice—to his former master. He does not call upon his "fellow-laborer" at Colosse to manumit the slave. But he styles Onesimus his son, a part of his own flesh, and exhorts Philemon to receive him not as a bondman, but as a beloved brother. Paul addresses him thus :—

"Wherefore, though I have much boldness in Christ to enjoin upon thee that which is befitting, yet for love's sake I beseech thee rather, being such a one as Paul an old man, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ, I beseech thee for my child, whom I begot in my bonds, Onesimus; who in time past was unprofitable to thee, but is now profitable to thee and to me; whom I have sent back; and do thou (receive) him, that is, my own flesh. Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might minister in the bonds of the Gospel; but I chose to do nothing without thy consent, that thy benefit may not be as from necessity, but willingly. For perhaps he was separated from thee for a season to this end, that thou shouldest receive him back as thine forever; no longer as a bond servant, but above a bond-servant, a brother-beloved, especially to me, but how much more to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord! If thou then regardest me as a partner, receive him as myself. And if he wrongeth thee in anything, or oweth thee, put that to my account. I Paul have written it with my own hand, I will repay it; not to say to thee, that to me thou owest even thy own self besides. Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord. Refresh my heart in Christ. Having confidence in thy obedience I have written to thee, knowing that thou wilt do even more than I say." [1]

There can be no doubt that the churches at the beginning were, on the whole, marked by an extraordinary religious elevation and purity of conduct. They were made

[1] From Prof. Noyes's translation (Philemon, vers. 8–22).

up mostly of the poor and obscure, who were drawn to embrace the Gospel by an inward need, and whose low position in the social scale was a standing ground of reproach against the new religion, from the side of its adversaries. Moved thus by spiritual hunger, and by no motive of self-interest, they laid hold of the priceless boon offered them in the Gospel, with all sincerity and earnestness. Subsequently, as the Church grew stronger, so that its offices became objects of ambition; especially when it ceased to be a persecuted sect, but rather a religion favored by the civil power, there were mingled in the ranks of ostensible believers a far larger proportion of the insincere and self-seeking. There was at first an enthusiasm for the faith, and for the propagation of it. There was an unconquerable firmness under persecution, without any mingling of hatred towards the authors of it. There was a love to the Apostles and to one another, which was expressed in prayers and supplications, as well as in substantial deeds of charity. In the reformation of men whose lives had been bad, the Gospel evinced a power such as put to shame the highest achievements of philosophy in this practical direction. An inspiration was furnished for the amendment of character such as the world had never witnessed before. This is evident from statements in the Apostolic Epistles, and in the early ecclesiastical writers. Paul, after enumerating various classes of evil-doers, as adulterers, fornicators, drunkards, extortioners, thieves, adds: "and such were some of you; but ye are washed, ye are sanctified" (1 Cor. vi. 10, 11, cf. Col. iii. 7). He writes to the Ephesian Christians: "Let him that stole, steal no more, but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good"—that, is labor in some good and honest vocation—"that he may have to give to him that needeth" (iv. 28). In the Ephesian Church,

there were persons who had been thieves. Now, instead of taking the property of others, they were to give away their own. "We," writes Justin Martyr, "who formerly were the slaves of lust, now only strive after purity; we, who took delight in arts of magic, now consecrate ourselves to the eternal and good God; we who loved the path to riches above every other, now give what we have to the common use and give to every one that needs; we who hated and destroyed one another, and would not even share the same hearth with those of another tribe, because of their different customs, now, since the coming of Christ, live together, and pray for our enemies, and endeavor to convince those who hate us without cause, so that they may order their lives according to Christ's glorious doctrine, and attain to the joyful hope of receiving like blessings with ourselves from God, the Lord of all."[1] Two qualities of the early Christians were especially conspicuous and marvellous in the eyes of their heathen acquaintance. The first was their love to one another. The second was their love to enemies, which appeared in connection with an heroic patience in the endurance of persecution, whether in the form of taunts and social ostracism, or robbery, bodily torture, and death. These sentiments were the more remarkable as found, it might be, in persons of little education, and strangers to the tenets of Philosophy. It was evident that a new principle of a mighty transforming power had entered into the world.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the Church of the Apostolic age was spotless. Among the Jewish Christians, a narrow legal spirit took possession of the party called Judaizers. On the Jewish side, there was a temptation to the undue estimation of riches and of the wealthy class (Acts v. 1–12, James ii. 5). Among the Gentile

[1] Apol. i. 14.

Christians of Greek extraction there was another class of faults. At Corinth, there was an ascetic party which was disposed to condemn marriage, at the same time that a Judaizing faction appears to have considered marriage obligatory. Women sometimes displayed an unchristian love for finery, or an unseemly disposition to make themselves conspicuous in church assemblies. There were two departures from the Christian standard of conduct, diverse from one another, and both of them characteristic sins of the Gentile communities of Christians. The one was the manifestation of an intellectual pride on the part of some, who considered themselves superior to others in their power of comprehending truth, and consequently looked with some disdain on Christians of ordinary capacity. A speculative tendency, and an excessive esteem of theoretical views of the Gospel, would naturally connect themselves with such a temper. Such a temper, if carried out, would give rise to an aristocracy of the intellect, akin to that which the schools of heathen philosophy had nurtured, and not less alien to the spirit of the Gospel than was the Judaic pride of race and sense of superiority in point of religious standing. The equality of believers, which was founded on the fact that Christianity addresses itself, not to the gifted in intellect especially, but to all classes alike, since it appeals to the moral and religious nature of men, would have been sacrificed, had the Corinthian affectation of "wisdom" been left unrebuked.

The other great evil on which the Apostle Paul had occasion to animadvert, in his Letters to the Corinthian Church, was the outbreaking of sensuality, in the shape of incontinence, and that in a most gross form, and in the shape of intemperance at the table, even in the Festivals of Charity, with which the Lord's Supper was joined. Individuals, forgetting the sacred nature of this commem-

oration, gave the rein to the appetite for food and drink. Indecency of this nature showed how hard it was to eradicate habits and curb propensities which had been fostered by heathen life. Considering what the converts had many of them been, prior to their conversion, the surprise which one may feel at such occurrences is diminished. These Epistles of the Apostle to the Gentiles present to our view the obscure communities which were forming themselves under his auspices in the wide-spread Empire of Rome. If they disclose dark features of human imperfection, they at the same time give one a glimpse of the mighty power of that new religion which was laying hold of the poor and wretched, and was beginning its work as a leaven in the midst of a corrupt and decaying world.

INDEX.

Abraham, his faith, 221.
Acte, mistress of Nero, 525.
Acts of the Apostles, written by the author of the third Gospel, 289; written by a companion of Paul, 290 seq.; critical attack upon the, 299 seq.; its relation to the Pauline Epistles, 315; its close, 316; its two divisions, 317; speeches in the, 310.
Æschylus, 116.
Agapæ, the history of the, 546 seq.
Agrippina, the mother of Nero, 217, 524; her death, 526.
Alexander, the Great, his empire, 49; effect of his Expedition, 56.
Alexandria, its character, 36.
Alogi, the, 320.
Amphitheatre, sports of the, 213 seq.
Amusements, view of the early Christians respecting, 569.
Ananus, 537.
Anaxagoras, 114, 119.
Angels, belief of the Jews respecting, 247.
Antilegomena, 574.
Antioch, the city of, 56; the church at, 479.
Antiochus Epiphanes, 228.
Apostles, the selection of the, 459 seq.; the preaching of the, 509 seq.; their addresses to Jews, 509; their preaching to Gentiles, 511; their conception of Christ, 512. See *Paul*, *John*, *James*, etc.
Arabia, Christianity in, 516.
Aristophanes, respecting Socrates, 119.
Aristotle, compared with Plato, 155; his doctrine of God, 155; his doctrine of the soul, 156; his Ethics, 156 seq.; his intellectualism, 157; on slavery, 158; on contemplation, 158 seq.; on the immoral influence of the Greek myths, 195; on infanticide, 207.
Arnold, Dr. T., 37, 404.
Arnold, Matthew, 330.
Assumptio Mosis, 250.
Augustine, 37, 43, 69, 73, 124; on Varro, 128; his Platonism, 147.
Augustus, deification of, 126; his reforms, 135 seq.; his efforts to promote marriages, 202.
Aurelius, M., on fame, 164; on citizenship of the world, 164; character of his "Meditations," 169.

Bacon, Lord, 22.
Banus, 418.
Baptism, in the Early Church, 565; of infants, 565 seq.
Barnabas, 58, 478, 517; Epistle of, 279.
Basilides, 387; his use of the Fourth Gospel, 336.
Baur, F. C., 170, 320, 332, 375, 375, 444, 454, 508; on the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles, 258.
Baxter, Richard, 412.
Becker, W. A., 209.
Bible, the growth of the, 4. See *Canon*.
Bingham, 382, 565.
Blackie, Prof. J. S., 117.
Bleek, 9, 259, 268, 279, 374, 424, 559, 565.

Blunt, J. H., 565.
Bœckh, 208.
Book of the Jubilees, 250.
Brittanicus, 525.
Butler, Archer, 148.
Butler, Bishop, on certain precepts of the O. T., 18; on the tendency of virtue to give supremacy to a state, 445.
Byron, 232.

Cæsar, Julius, 204, 206, 207, 216, 217; a democratic leader, 50; cosmopolitan policy of, 51; favors the Jews, 68; deification of, 126; his skepticism, 131; his visit to Cicero, 204.
Caius, 386, 513.
Calvin, John, 565; on the Sermon on the Mount, 376.
Canaanites, the extermination of the, 14 seq.
Canon, the Jewish, 246; formation of the N. T., 572 seq.
Cato, 201, 202; on Greek learning, 57; his treatment of his slaves, 210.
Celsus, 73; his use of the Fourth Gospel, 335; his system, 387; his attack upon Christianity, 540.
Cerinthus, 345; his system, 386; relation of the Fourth Gospel to his system, 388.
Christ, His use of the O. T., 6; on the relation of the old dispensation to the new, 12, 23 seq.; perfect religion realized in, 25; Revelation perfected in, 26; hopes of the Apostles respecting the Second Advent of, 364 seq.; His teaching as to the Second Advent, 367 seq.; His relation to John the Baptist, 420 seq.; events in His childhood, 420 seq.; date of His birth, 423; the genealogies of, 423; His family, 424; His life at Nazareth, 426; His baptism, 427 seq.; His temptation, 431; the early part of His ministry, 432 seq.; His miracle at Cana, 434; at Capernaum, 434; drives out the money-changers, 434; His interview with the Woman of Samaria, 436; a day in the life of, 437; His claim to be the Messiah, 441 seq.; styles Peter the Rock, 443; His conception of His kingdom, 443 seq.; significance of His Temptation, 446 seq.; His independence of parties, 447; refuses to exercise civil authority, 448; character of His legislation, 449; character of His disciples, 450; His perception of the obstacles in His path, 450; His foresight of the effect of His teaching, 451; His expectation of death, 452; in what sense He claimed to be a king, 452 seq.; His figurative descriptions of His Kingdom, 453 seq.; enjoins silence as to His miracles, 455; the means on which He relied, 456 seq.; His teaching, 456; design of His parables, 458; His choice of disciples, 459; His relations to Judas, 460; the reality of His miracles, 462 seq.; Rationalistic conception of, 464; nature of His miracles, 465 seq.; upon the relation of the Gospel to the old Dispensation, 469 seq.; the fact of His resurrection, 506 seq.; the Apostles' Conception of, 512 seq.
Christianity, an historical religion, 1; its organic connection with the O. T. religion, 5, 6; an advance upon the O. T. religion, 6; so described in the N. T., 11 seq.; the absolute religion, 25; completes the revelation of God, 26; a universal religion, 27; a religion of principles, 28; character of its institutions, 29; its development since the Apostles, 30; the perfection of its ethics, 31 seq.; its relation to heathen religions, 34 seq.; its essential characteristic, 39; its separation from Judaism, 469; its spread in the Apostolic Age, 506 seq.; among the Jews, 514; by the labors of Paul, 515 seq.; first preached in cities, 516; the attack of Celsus upon, 541; hostility of Roman

government to, 541; Gibbon's reasons for the spread of, 542; the main causes of its rapid spread, 545; its characteristics in the first century, 546 seq. *See Christ, Kingdom*, etc.
Christians, the early, the mutual love of, 568; their feeling towards civil rulers, 571; their virtues, 578; their faults, 579 seq.
Chrysippus, 162.
Chrysostom, 565.
Church, early polity of the, 377 seq.
Church, the Apostolic, state of, after the Ascension, 472; rise of a liberal view as to the Gentiles in, 473. See *Christ, Christianity, Churches, the Apostolic.*
Churches, the Apostolic, their organization, 550 seq.; their limits, municipal, 556; their discipline, 557; their offices were *charisms*, 558; their observances, 561 seq.
Church at Rome, its tone in the Epistle of Clement, 556 seq.
Cicero, 58, 70, 127, 130, 181, 201, 206, 401; on Natural Law, 53; on the study of Greek, 57; on the suppression of religious dissent, 70; on remorse, 127; on Varro, 128; on the popular superstition, 129 seq.; his spirit of humanity, 181; his doctrine of immortality, 181; the practical effect of his philosophy, 181 seq.; on manual labor, 194; Cæsar's visit to, 204.
Circus, the Roman, 212 seq.
Claudius, 217.
Cleanthes, 163, 174.
Clement, of Alexandria, 552; on John's Gospel, 330.
Clement, of Rome, 531, 551.
Clement, of Rome, Epistle of, 556; its supplication for Rulers, 571.
Clementine Homilies, 331.
Cleopatra, 230.
Clovis, 13.
Coliseum, 214.
Confucius, 38.
Constant, B., 76.
Constantine, 218.
Corinth, its character, 519.
Council, the Apostolic, 480 seq.; vindication of Luke's account of, 300 seq.; import of its prescriptions, 303 seq.
Cowper, 73.
Criticism, Biblical, at the Revival of Learning, 390; by Luther, 391; by Calvin, 391; by the Arminian scholars, 392; character of German, 392.
Curtius, on the fall of the Greek Religion, 120.
Cyprian, 565.
Cyrenius, 423.
Cyrus, 227.

Danaids and Dircæ, 532.
Daniel, book of, 249.
Deborah, the Prophetess, her song, 19 seq., 224.
De Maistre, 30.
Demons, belief of the Jews respecting, 247.
Denis, J., 170.
Derenbourg, on the name Sadducee, 236.
Development of Christianity, true and false conceptions of, 30.
De Wette, 239, 268.
Diaconate, creation of the, 550.
Diagoras of Melos, 115.
Disciples, their number at the death of Christ, 512. See *Christ, Apostles*, etc.
Dispensation, the Jewish, distinguished from the Christian, 23.
Döllinger, 60, 198, 208, 235.
Dorner, J. A., 253, 254, 513.
Dwight, Prof. Theodore, 54.

Ebionism, 383 seq.
"Ecce Homo," 452, 453.
Ecclesiastes, book of, 9.
Edwards, Jonathan, 146.
Elders, their function, 554.
Ellicott, 284.
Emperors, Roman, deification of, 125.
Ennius, 124.
Enoch, book of, 250.
Ephesus, its character, 520.
Epictetus, on the Roman Empire, 61; on love to enemies, 165; on resignation, 165; on slavery, 171;

on forbearance, 177; on the Cynic Missionary, 188.
Epicurus, his Theology, 160 seq.; his Ethics, 162; spread of his philosophy, 186.
Episcopacy, in the early church, 378 seq.; rise of, 551 seq.
Essenes, the, their original character, 387, 239 seq.
Euemerus, 115.
Euripides, his skeptical tendency, 116.
Eusebius, 266, 278, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 360, 515, 522.
Eutychius, bp. of Constantinople, 553.
Evangelists, their office, 555.
Ewald, 5, 11, 26, 223, 225, 234, 241, 252, 304, 305, 450, 530.
Ezra, 226.

Farrar, F. W., 372, 423; on the date of the Crucifixion, 412.
Flavius Clemens, 522.
Flavia Domitilla, 522.
Friedländer, L., 60, 61, 62, 65, 133, 193, 202, 211, 213, 522, 531.

Galilee, its condition at the birth of Christ, 255.
Germann, W., 515.
Gfrörer, 247.
Gibbon 59, 528; on the Golden Rule, 38; on the hold of ancient polytheism upon life, 136; his reasons for the spread of Christianity, 543 seq.
Gieseler, 198; on the origin of the Gospels, 264.
Gladiatorial combats, their origin and character, 213 seq.; view of Christians respecting, 570.
Gnosticism, notices of, in the N. T., 347; characteristics of, 385. See *Cerinthus, Basilides, Valentinus.*
Godet, F., 352, 357, 461.
Golden Rule, the, 380.
Gospel, hypothesis of a primitive written, 263 seq.; hypothesis of a primitive oral, 267.
Gospels, Apocryphal, 358 seq.
Gospel, Fourth, compared with the synoptics, 338 seq., 343; discourses in the, 342; Catholic spirit of the, 344; relation of its doctrine to that of Philo, 345; not dualistic, 345; its relation to the Apocalypse, 346 seq.; the work of one writer, 350; composed at one heat, 350; its author a Jew, 351; independence of its author, 353; historical spirit of its author, 354 seq.; its author's love to Jesus, 357; if spurious, an anomalous product, 358 seq.; power and elevation of the, 361; on the Second Advent, 376.
Gospel, Fourth, the genuineness of the, 320 seq.; testimony of Polycarp to, 321 seq.; of the Muratorian Canon to, 330; of Clement of Alexand. to, 330; of Justin Martyr to, 330; from Papias to, 331 seq.; relation of Paschal controversies to, 333; evidence from heretical sects for, 335 seq.; internal evidence for, 357 seq.
Gospels, the synoptical, why so called, 259; their peculiarities, 259 seq.; quotations from the O. T. in, 262 seq.; sections in, 264; mutual relations of, 267 seq.; their sources, 284; compared with the Gospel of John, 338 seq.
Gracchus, C., 50.
Grätz, 233, 237, 239.
Greece, its condition in the age of Augustus, 191.
Greek language, spread of the, 56 seq.
Greek Religion, the, implies faith in the supernatural, 74; conflict of conceptions in, 75; three phases in, 76; origin of its offensive myths, 112 seq.; its decline, 113 seq.; effect of rational inquiry upon, 114; allegorical treatment of, 114; theory of Euemerus respecting its myths, 115; how treated by Euripides, 116; influence of the Sophists upon, 117; influence of historical study upon, 117; effect of the Peloponnesian war on, 120; effect of the fall of liberty upon, 120.

Greek Religion in the age of Sophocles, its improvement, 93; its higher conception of the gods, 93 seq.; its monotheistic tendency, 95 seq.; its doctrine of the divine government, 96 seq; of retribution, 97 seq.; elevation of the, 100; its doctrine of fate, 100; its doctrine of Nemesis, 101; the multiplying of divinities in the, 102 seq.; its rites and ceremonies, 103 seq.; its ethical ideal, 104; its teaching as to the treatment of enemies, 105; as to compassion and kindness, 106 seq.; as to the marriage relation, 107; as to civil loyalty, 107; as to sin; 108; as to the troubles of life, 108 seq.; as to the future life, 110 seq.
Greeks, states of the, 48; their commerce and settlements, 56; spread of their language and literature, 57, 59; their characteristics, 66, 12; their degradation in the age of Augustus, 192.
Gregory, C. R., 320.
Grote, George, on a passage of Bishop Butler, 19; on the decline of the Greek mythology, 114; on the genuineness of Plato's dialogues, 338.

Hadley, J. 53.
Harmonists, method of the, 404 seq.
Hase, K., 349.
Hausrath, 236, 240, 243, 428.
Heathen Religion, its relation to Christianity, 34 seq.; law and prophecy in, 35; immorality connected with its worship, 198.
Hebrew People, purpose of God respecting the, 35; religious advantage of, 36 seq.
Hebrews, Gospel of the, 281.
Hefele, 532, 571.
Herder, 12.
Herod, "the Great," 230 seq.; his characteristics, 231; his edifices, 232; the massacre by, at Bethlehem, 422.
Herod Agrippa, 217.
Herod Antipas, his relation to John the Baptist, 438.
Herodias, 438.
Herodotus, 48, 117; on the doctrine of Nemesis, 101.
Hilary Ambrosiaster, 552, 554.
Hilgenfeld, 258, 283, 328; his criticism of the third Gospel, 295 seq.
Hippolytus, 336.
Holtzmann, H. J., 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 266, 278, 283, 290, 298, 350, 397, 450.
Homeric Theology, on the nature and character of the gods, 76 seq.; on the administration of the world, 80; on the relation of the gods to each other, 81 seq.; on the supremacy of Zeus, 82; on the modes of divine revelation, 82 seq.; on piety and the expressions of it in worship and conduct, 84 seq.; on practical duties, 86 seq.; on the treatment of enemies, 87 seq.; on hospitality, 89; on sin, retribution, and atonement, 89 seq.; on life, death, and immortality, 91 seq.
Homologoumena, 574.
Honorius, 218.
Howson, J. S., 517, 565.
Hyrcanus I., 229.

Ignatius, 382, 551, 555, 575.
Ihne, Prof., 76.
Immortality, doctrine of, 8; in the O. T., 8; not the substance of Christianity, 39. See *Socrates, Plato, Aristotle.*
Infanticide, 205; in ancient society, 206 seq.
Irenæus, 276, 278, 320, 324, 326, 328, 329, 379, 386, 388, 565, 566; his relations to Polycarp, 321 seq.; errors of, 325 seq.
Isocrates, 38, 114.
Israel, 224.
Italy, condition of, in the age of Augustus, 193.

Jacob, F., 197.
Jamblichus, 178.

James, the several Apostles of this name, 424, 514.
James, the brother of Christ, 479; at the council at Jerusalem, 481.
James, the brother of John, 478.
Jeremiah, the Prophet, his prediction of the new covenant, 10.
Jerome, 552, 554.
Jerusalem, siege of, 538 seq.
Jews, their acquaintance with Greek, 58; their dispersion, 67; in Egypt, 68; at Antioch, 68; in Rome, 68; favored by Julius Cæsar, 69; Tacitus respecting the, 69; their rigid monotheism, 69; their national unity, 221; effect of their abode in Egypt, 221; organized as a nation, 222; the character of their religion, 222; under a monarchy, 223 seq.; division of their kingdom, 224; the Exile of the, 224; prophesy among the, 225; deliverance of them by Cyrus, 225; under the Hagiocracy, 226; under the Greeks, 227; their resistance to heathen influences, 228; under the Maccabees, 228 seq.; under the Romans and Idumean princes, 230 seq.; their condition under Herod, 231; led by the Pharisees, 233 seq.; parties among the, 233 seq.; their synagogues, 243 seq.; their courts, 245 seq.; their theology at the Christian era, 246; their Messianic expectation, 248 seq., in Alexandria, 253 seq.
Job, book of, 9.
John, the Apostle, in Asia Minor, 327 seq., 515, 534. See *Gospel, the Fourth, Gospel the Fourth, genuineness of the.*
John the Baptist, 9; his character and work, 417 seq.; not one of the Essenes, 418; elements of his preaching, 419; his baptism, 420; effect of his preaching, 420; his connection with Jesus, 420 seq., 427 seq.; his doubt respecting Jesus, 430; his death, 439 seq.
John, First Epistle of, its relation to the Fourth Gospel, 337.
Josephus, 67, 217, 229, 230, 232, 233, 234, 235, 238, 239, 240, 245, 255, 418, 420, 422, 423, 533, 535, 536, 537, 539.
Jowett, Prof., 206; on the morals of ancient heathenism, 220.
Judaizers, at Rome, 520.
Judas Iscariot, 460.
Julian, the Emperor, 73.
Jus feciale, 53.
Jus gentium, 52 seq.
Justin Martyr, 147, 236, 249, 281, 286, 287, 330, 384, 547, 548, 563, 564, 565, 578.
Juvenal, 192, 194, 204, 210.

Keim, 242, 327, 336, 344.
Kingdom of God, its rise and progress, 4; its theocratic stage, 7, 27; made universal through Christ, 27.
Kuenen, 247.

Lactantius, 41.
Lardner, N., 524.
Latin language, its boundaries, 58, 60.
Laurent, F., 40.
Law, Roman, see *Romans.*
Lightfoot, Prof. J. B., 167, 169, 244, 277, 278, 279, 280, 293, 302, 309, 332, 333, 366, 387, 388, 424, 470, 478, 481, 522, 523, 531, 532, 551, 552, 557, 567.
Lipsius, 253, 304, 515.
Livy, 199, 403.
Locke, John, 146.
Lucan, 172.
Lucian, 71, 541.
Lucretius, his theology, 160.
Luke, mention of, by Paul, 286; sources of his information, 289; a Pauline disciple, 290; his credibility, 293; his style, 317 seq.
Luke, Gospel of, used by Justin Martyr, 287; its relation to Marcion's Gospel, 287 seq.; Hilgenfeld's theory of the, 295 seq. See *Gospels, Synoptical; Luke; Luke, the writings of.*
Luke, the writings of, 286 seq.; attacks upon the credibility of, 293 seq., 299, 309 seq.
Luthardt, 320.

Luther, 565.
Lutterbeck, 236.

Maccabees, the, 228.
Maccabeus, Jonathan, 229.
Maccabeus, Judas, 228; his alliance with the Romans, 229; his relation to the Pharisees, 235.
Maccabeus, Simon, 229.
Maine, Sir H., 54; on the influence of Stoicism, 171.
Marcion, his Gospel, 287; his acquaintance with John's Gospel, 335.
Mariamne, wife of Herod, 230.
Mangold, 281, 307, 352, 396, 347.
Marius, C., 50.
Mark, 516, 518.
Mark, Gospel of, quotations from the O. T. in the, 262; its relation to Matthew and Luke, 267; its independence, 269; not an abridgement, 269 seq.; its graphic style, 275; Papias on the origin of the, 276 seq.
Marquardt, J., 47, 122.
Marriages, of Christians with heathen, Apostle Paul's teaching respecting, 570.
Marsilius Ficinus, 141.
Mary, the mother of Jesus, 421.
Matthew, Gospel of, catholic features in the, 396; its relation to the other synoptics, 259 seq.; quotations from the O. T. in the, 262; compared with Luke and Mark, 267 seq.; Papias respecting the, 278 seq.; was it written in Aramaic? 281 seq.; its credibility, 283 seq.
Merivale, C., 47, 54, 198, 524, 529.
Messalina, 202.
Messiah, the expectation of, 8, 228, 248 seq.; how described by the prophets, 10, 26; the Jews' conception of His person, 251; the Jews' conception of His kingdom, 370 seq.; forerunner of, expected, 416.
Metrodorus, 115.
Meyer, 292, 302, 304, 308, 317, 366, 374, 419, 424, 470, 559, 565.
Mill, J. S., on the ethics of Christianity, 31 seq.
Milton, John, 21, 116.
Miracles, of Jesus, their reality, 462 seq.; their nature, 465; their design, 467.
Mithridates, 60.
Mœhler, J., 30.
Mommsen, T., 58, 69, 201, 202, 204.
Morals of Ancient Heathenism, 191 seq.; difficulty of judging respecting the, 194; degradation of, in the age of Tacitus, 196; influence of corrupt myths upon the, 196; described by Paul, 196; described by Seneca, 196; special vices belonging to the, 198 seq., 219.
Moses, 222.
Mozly, J., on the wars of extermination recorded in the O. T., 17, 18, 20.
Müller, K. O., on the religion of the Greeks, 74, 75, 76, 113, 138, 139.
Müller, Max, 75.
Muratori, canon of, 277; on John's Gospel, 330.

Nägelsbach, 76, 85, 86, 90.
Nazareth, its situation, 426.
Neander, 14, 37, 147, 180, 258, 318, 362, 367, 372, 394, 395, 422, 423, 428, 434, 508, 565, 566.
Nebuchadnezzar, 224.
Nehemiah, 226.
Nero, his popularity in the Roman provinces, 51; persecution by, 524; his life and character, 524 seq.; his connection with the fire at Rome, 526 seq.; his cruelty to Christians, 528 seq.; his visit to Greece, 532; his death, 533.
New Platonism, 178; its relation to Christianity, 180.
Newman, J. H., on Development, 30; on Gibbon's reasons for the spread of Christianity, 543.
Norton, A., 260, 262.

Octavia, wife of Nero, 525.
Old Testament, moral difficulties in the, 12 seq.
Old Testament Religion, in what sense imperfect, 6; its progressive

development, 7 seq.; its conception of God, 27; legal character of, 28; its relation to Christianity, 36.
Origen, 286, 566; his Platonism, 147.
Ovid, 218.

Pæderasty, in ancient society, 205.
Paley, 315.
Papias, evidence respecting the Fourth Gospel from, 351 seq.; on the origin of the Gospel of Mark, 276; respecting the Gospel of Matthew, 278.
Paul, the Apostle, on the "fulness of time," 1; on the defect of the O. T. system, 24; on heathen religion, 34, 38; on the unbelief of the Jews, 36, 38; at Lystra, 58; on worship at Athens, 103; on the morals of ancient society, 196; genuineness of the epistles ascribed to him, 258; did he use a written gospel? 258; his references to Luke, 286; his relation to the "pillar" Apostles," 300 seq.; his relation to the decree of the Apostolic Council, 301 seq.; his doctrinal position, 476 seq.; his visit to Peter, 477; his training, 478; a witness to the Resurrection of Jesus, 506; the character of his preaching, 512; his conception of Christ, 513; his career, 515 seq.; date of his conversion, 517; a prisoner at Rome, 522; did he visit Spain? 523; his death, 524; on mixed marriages, 570; his Ep. to Philemon, 576.
Persians, Empire of the, 48.
Peter, the Apostle, his enlightenment as to the rights of the Gentiles, 474; at the Council at Jerusalem, 481; his alleged Judaizing spirit, 299; the labors of, 514; his martyrdom, 514 seq.
Pharisees, their resistance to Herod, 233; contrasted with the Sadducees, 233; their origin, 234; their legalism, 236; their merits and faults, 236 seq.; their dogmas, 238.
Philip, the Deacon, 474.
Philo, on the Roman Empire, 61; his life and tenets, 253 seq.; his conception of the Logos, 240, 345; his doctrine compared with that of the Fourth Gospel, 345.
Philosophy, its influence among the Romans in the second century, 186; its insufficiency, 189.
Philosophy of the Greeks, how it prepared for Christianity, 140; its character after Aristotle, 159 seq.; its practical value, 180 seq. See *Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Stoicism*, etc.
Pilate, Pontius, 236.
Pindar, his protest against immoral myths, 113.
Plato, 200, 206; on the characteristic of the Greeks, 66; on the immoral myths, 114, 195; his protest against atheism, 138; his relations to Socrates, 147; his spiritual tone, 147; his conception of God compared with the Christian, 148; his dualism, 149; on divine providence, 149; on suicide, 149; his Hellenic pride, 150; on the properties and destiny of the soul, 151; on the need of redemption, 152; on the method of redemption, 153; his conception of virtue, 153; his intellectualism, 154; his republic, 155; on infanticide, 207.
Platonic Philosophy, 370 seq.
Pliny, 203, 240; on the Roman Empire, 61; his religious opinions, 131 seq.
Pliny, the Younger, 172; on forbearance, 177; his Letter to Trajan, 542, 547, 562.
Plotinus, his philosophical system, 179.
Plutarch, 60, 115, 134, 172, 200, 201, 206, 216, 237, 401; his religious position, 72; on the superstition of Nikias, 119; on superstition and infidelity, 134 seq.; on forbearance, 177; on consolation, 184 seq.; on the Gallic wars, 191.
Polybius, 206.

Polycarp, 552; his relations to Irenæus, 321.
Pompeius, at Jerusalem, 229.
Pomponia Græcina, 521.
Poppæa Sabina, 525.
Porphyry, 178.
Prætor, edict of the, 52, 54, 55.
Prætor peregrinus, 53.
Preller, 122.
Pressensé, E., 372, 374; on the Gospel of Matthew, 284.
Proclus, 178.
Prophets, the Hebrew, their relation to the age of Moses, 8; limitations of their knowledge, 9 seq.; their idea of the Messiah, 26; their function, 222.
Protagoras, 117.
Proverbs, book of, 23.
Psalms, the imprecatory, 21.
Pythagoras, 140.

Rabbis, schools among them, 246.
Rehoboam, his arrogance, 233.
Religion of the Greeks and Romans, its relation to Christian revelation, 137 seq.; its drift towards monotheism, 139. See *Homeric Religion, Greek Religion in the Age of Sophocles*, etc.
Renaissance, in Italy, its rationalistic tone, 391.
Renan, 280, 292, 352, 529, 530, 532.
Reuss, 263, 264, 310, 388, 396, 397.
Revelation, its historical groundwork, 2; the design of, 3; reaches its climax in Christ, 26.
Revelation, book of, 533; on the imports of Rome, 63; compared with John's Gospel, 340; its date, 534.
Ritschl, 304, 471, 482.
Ritter, H., 148.
Roman Empire, its relations to Christianity, 40 seq.; growth of the, 40; fostered a cosmopolitan feeling, 42; extent and general character of the, 42 seq.; classification of its provinces, 45 seq.; compared with previous empires, 47 seq.; leveling tendency of the, 51; how regarded by the provinces, 51; Romano-Hellenic in its character, 55; intercourse of its inhabitants, 60 seq.; produced peace, 61; its great roads, 61 seq.; the extent of its religious toleration, 70; mingling of religions in the, 70 seq.; sentiment of humanity awakened by the, 73; its condition under Augustus, 191; luxury and extravagance in the, 202.
Roman Literature, skeptical tendency of the, 124.
Roman Religion, the, contrasted with that of the Greeks, 121; its divinities and their worship, 122 seq.; amalgamation of the Greek Religion with, 123 seq.; how undermined, 124 seq.; worship of the emperors in, 125 seq.; skepticism respecting, 127 seq.; effect of the reforms of Augustus upon, 135; the influence of its rites, 136.
Romans, policy of the, 48; jurisprudence of the, 52 seq.; their genius for rule, 66; decline of their morals, 197; divorces among the, 201; amusements of the, 211 seq. See *Roman Empire*.
Rome, the Church at, 521, 531; union of the races at the foundation of, 49; citizenship of, 50; its condition in the age of Augustus, 193.
Ropes, C. J. H., 322, 568.
Rousseau, 65.
Ruskin, 65.

Sadducees, their origin, 234; their social position, 235; their views of the Old Testament, 235; their theology, 238 seq.
Sallust, 131, 186.
Samaria, at the birth of Christ, 256.
Samaritans, 224.
Samuel, the Prophet, 222.
Sanday, Mr., on Marcion's Gospel, 288.
Sanhedrim, its constitution, 245.
Schaff, Dr. P., 559, 571.
Schelling, on heathen religions, 38.
Schiller, H., 527, 529, 530.
Schleiermacher, on heathen reli-

gion, 35; on the synoptical Gospels, 264.
Schmidt, C., 170.
Schürer, 233, 240, 252, 253, 233, 290, 423; on the Paschal controversies, 334.
Scribes, the, their office, 242 seq.
Seneca, 203, 204; on the popular superstition, 129; his type of Stoicism, 165; on sin, 166; on piety and worship, 166 seq.; Christian character of his precepts, 167 seq.; his personal character, 168; his relation to Paul, 169 seq.; on suicide, 174; on the equality of mankind, 176; on the wickedness of society, 196; on gladiatorial combats, 218; on the spread of Judaism, 69.
Septuagint, origin of the, 253.
Sibylline Books, 250.
Skepticism, in the Roman Empire, 71, 124 seq.
Slavery, its effect, 193, 194; its character in ancient states, 208 seq.; among the Greeks, 209; among the Romans, 209 seq.; teaching of the Apostles concerning, 575 seq.
Smith, Dr. Payne, on the nature of prophecy, 10.
Socrates, rejected the immoral myths, 114; the occasion of his death, 119; his philosophy, 140 seq.; on the soul, 141; his doctrine of theism, 142; on true worship, 143; his moral spirit, 144; his belief in immortality, 145; his theory of virtue, 145 seq.; his humility, 146.
Solomon, character of his reign, 223.
"Son of Man," origin of the title. 250.
Sophists, character and influence of the, 116 seq.
Stanley, A. P., 253, 426.
Stephen, character of his discourse, 473.
Stoicism, its effect on Roman law, 53, 170 seq.; its two forms, 162; its metaphysics, 162 seq.; its ethics, 163 seq.; its doctrine of preferables, 164; its cosmopolitan tendency, 164 seq.; the Roman, 165; compared with Christianity, 172 seq.; its spread among the Romans, 187; the creed of noble Romans, 219.
Strauss, his "Life of Jesus," 398.
Suetonius, 198, 206, 208, 522, 535.
Sunday, the observance of, in the primitive Church, 562.
"Supernatural Religion," 282, 300, 301, 302, 306, 307, 308, 310, 311.
Synagogues, their organization and character, 243.

Tacitus, 48, 51, 69, 126, 127, 186, 202, 217, 219, 402; on the popularity of the Empire, 51; on the Jews, 69; on the Neronian persecution, 529.
Talmud, the, on the Messiah, 252.
Telemachus, 218.
Tennyson, 116.
Terence, 73.
Tertullian, 41, 286, 335, 361, 386, 514, 540, 548, 565, 566, 569, 571.
Theatre, the Roman, 212; views of the early Christians respecting the, 570.
Theodoret, 218.
Theology, how distinguished from philosophy, 5.
Thierry, A., 43.
Tholuck, A., 197, 205.
Thomas, the Apostle, 516.
Thucydides, his historical feeling, 118; on the moral effect of the Peloponnesian war, 120.
Titus, his siege of Jerusalem, 538 seq.
Tongues, the gift of, 559.
Trajan, 214.
Troplong, M., 170, 171.
Tübingen School, principles of the, 383 seq. See *Baur, F. C., Hilgenfeld.*

Valentinus, his use of the four Gospels, 387, 335.
Varro, his "Antiquities," 128.
Verres, 52.
Vespasian, made the commander against the Jews, 535; his conquest of Galilee, 536.
Virgil, 40, 66, 67.

Von Reumont, 47, 529.

Wall, 565.
Walter, F., 50.
War, the Jewish, its beginning, 534.
Welcker, 82.
Westcott, Prof., 262, 275, 276, 282, 283, 284.
Winer, 565.
Women, their character and position in antiquity, 199 seq.
Woolsey, T. D., 423.
Worship, its form in the early church, 563 seq.; origin of liturgical, 566.

Xenophanes, attacks the immoral myths, 113; on the anthropomorphism of the heathen religions, 113.
Xenophon, on the character of Socrates, 141 seq.

Zealots, Jewish, 537 seq.
Zeller, 117, 148, 291, 320; on the Sadducees, 241.
Zeno, 162, 174; on the universal community, 176.
Zoroastrian Religion, the, 26.
Zumpt, on ancient slavery, 211.

Hebrew Preparation [illegible]
N. T. [illegible]

[illegible] Chap. II
N. T. [illegible]

2 & 3 Cont.
Ecc., Rel., & Moral Life of X
Early Years of X by Vol. IV
Pressensé

Laws change -

00 B.C.

international laws - -

Roman law follows

Cicero eternal principal

Soc — Plat — Ars

Soul — super terrestrial — Theist - pure energy

nour — not creator or ruler

~~[illegible]~~

God - Pure — Pure

Creator — Person

Providence — creator + fashions

Guide — Providence

dualism — dualism

Ethics

conscious right

bases intellectualism - redemption — confusion to [illegible]

intellectualism — not God like

like God — not intellect

some save — (pride

Hellenic — but slaver

Immortality — Images

Confident — Virtue — Happiness

Virtue Happiness — Story

Epic — Deity = Matter

Gods isolated — materialist - evolution

Materialist — Fate + Providence

No immortality — Intellectual

Virtue good

ethics

Pleasant

William Carey Int. University

3 1539 0059338